

❖ HEBRAICA. ❖

VOL. VII.

OCTOBER, 1890.

NO. I.

THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION. III. GEN. 37:2-EX. 12:51.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

A. Gen. 37:2-50:26.

The first thirty-six chapters of Genesis have been discussed in previous articles; and no justification has yet been found for the critical hypothesis that the book is compounded from pre-existing documents. We proceed to inquire whether this hypothesis has any better support in the only remaining section of this book, "the generations of Jacob," 37:2-50:26.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

1. The Unity of Plan.

The divisive hypothesis encounters here in full measure the same insuperable difficulty, which meets it throughout the Book of Genesis, and particularly in the life of Abraham and the early history of Jacob. The unity of plan and purpose, which pervades the whole, so that every constituent part has its place and its function and nothing can be severed from it without evident mutilation, positively forbids its being rent asunder in the manner proposed by the critics. If ever a literary product bore upon its face the evidence of its oneness, this is true of the exquisite and touching story of Joseph, which is told with such admirable simplicity and a pathos that is unsurpassed, every incident grouped with the most telling effect, until in the supreme crisis the final disclosure is made. No such high work of art was ever framed by piecing together selected fragments of diverse origin.

The critics tell us that the apparent unity is due to the skill of the redactor. But the suggestion is altogether impracticable. A writer, who gathers his mate-

rials from various sources, may elaborate them in his own mind and so give unity to his composition. But a redactor, who limits himself to piecing together extracts culled from different works by distinct authors varying in conceptions, method and design, can by no possibility produce anything but patchwork, which will betray itself by evident seams, mutilated figures and want of harmony in the pattern. No such incongruities can be detected in the passage before us by the most searching examination. All that the critics affect to discover vanish upon a fair and candid inspection.

Moreover, the story of Joseph, complete as it is in itself is but one link in a uniform and connected chain, and is of the same general pattern with those that precede it. With striking individual diversities both of character and experience the lives of the several patriarchs are, nevertheless, cast in the same general mould. Divine revelations are made to Joseph at the outset, forecasting his future, 37:5sq., as to Abraham, 12:1sq., and to Jacob, 28:11sq. Each was sent away from his paternal home and subjected to a series of trials, issuing both in discipline of character and in ultimate prosperity and exaltation. And the story of Joseph fits precisely into its place in the general scheme, which it is the purpose of Genesis to trace, by which God was preparing and training a people for himself. By a series of marvelous providences, as the writer does not fail to point out, 45:5,7; 50:20, the chosen seed was preserved from extinction and located within the great empire of Egypt, as had been already foreshown to Abraham, 15:13sq., that they might unfold into a nation ready, when the proper time should arrive, to be transplanted into Canaan.

These broad and general features, in which the same constructive mind is discernible throughout, are lost sight of by critics, who occupy themselves with petty details, spying out doublets in every emphatic repetition or in the similar features of distinct events, finding occasions of offence in every transition or digression however natural and appropriate, and creating variance by setting separate parts of the same transaction in antagonism, as though each were exclusive of the other, when in fact they belong together and are perfectly consistent, or by dislocating phrases and paragraphs from their true connection and imposing upon them senses foreign to their obvious intent. These artifices are perpetually resorted to by the critics, and constitute in fact their stock arguments, just because they refuse to apprehend the author's plan, and to judge of the fitness of every particular from his point of view, but insist instead upon estimating everything from some self-devised standard of their own.

Vater, to whom the Pentateuch was a mass of heterogeneous fragments, and who was ready to go to any length in the work of disintegration, nevertheless says* that the history of Joseph is "a connected whole. To rend it asunder

* *Commentar über d. Pentateuch*, I., p. 290; III., p. 435.

would be to do violence to the narrative." And Tuch, who finds a double narrative throughout the rest of Genesis, declares that it is impossible to do so here. "Several wrong courses have been ventured upon," he says,* "in respect to the narrator of the life of Joseph. Some relying upon insecure or misunderstood criteria have sought to extort two divergent accounts. Others have held that the documents have been so worked over that it is impracticable to separate them with any degree of certainty. But we must insist upon the close connection of the whole recital, in which one thing carries another along with it, and recognize in that which is continuously written the work of one author." And he adds† respecting ch. 37: "This section in particular has been remarkably maltreated by the divisive document and redactor hypotheses of Ilgen and Gramberg without bringing forth anything but an arbitrary piece of mosaic work, which is shattered by the inner consistency and connection of the passage itself." The posthumous editor of Tuch's Commentary interposes the caveat that "since Hupfeld and Böhmer, the unity of the history of Joseph can no longer be maintained." But the fact is that no inconsistencies have since been pretended in this narrative, which were not already pointed out by Ilgen and Gramberg. Whether the later attempts to establish duplicate accounts have been more successful than those which Tuch so pointedly condemns, we shall inquire presently.

The urgent motive, which impels the most recent critics to split the history of Joseph asunder at all hazards is thus frankly stated by Wellhausen:‡ "The principal source for this last section of Genesis is JE. It is to be presumed that this work is here as elsewhere compounded of J and E. Our previous results urge to this conclusion, and would be seriously shaken if this were not demonstrable. I hold, therefore, that the attempt "to dismember the flowing narrative of Joseph into its sources" is not a mistaken one, but as necessary as the decomposition of Genesis in general."

2. Lack of Continuity in the Documents.

If distinct documents have been combined in this portion of Genesis, the critical analysis which disentangles them and restores each to its original separateness, might be expected to bring forth orderly narratives, purged of interpolations and dislocations, with the true connection restored and a consequent gain in each in significance, harmony and clearness. Instead of this there is nothing to show for P, J or E but mutilated fragments, which yield no continuous or intelligible narrative, but require for their explanation and to fill their *lacunae* precisely those passages which the critical process has rent from them. We are expected to assume with no other evidence than that the exigencies of the

* *Commentar über die Genesis*, 2d ed., p. 417.

† *Ibid.*, p. 424.

‡ *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 52.

hypothesis require it, that these P, J and E fragments were originally filled out into as many complete documents, but that the missing parts were removed by R.

3. The Divine Names.

The divine names here give no aid in the matter of critical division. Yahweh occurs in but three of these fourteen chapters, and in only eight verses, each time with evident appropriateness. It is found in connection with displays of God's punitive righteousness toward offenders 38:7,10 (no other name of God in the chapter), or his gracious care of Joseph as one of the chosen race, 39:2,3,5,21, 23 (inseparable from the rest of the chapter, where Elohim is found, v. 9), and in a pious ejaculation of the dying patriarch Jacob, 49:18, (in the same discourse with Elohim and Shaddai, v. 25). Hupfeld, *Quellen*, p. 178, confesses the embarrassment, which the critics find from the use of אלהים in the history of Joseph in a manner which does not square with their maxims.

4. Diction and Style.

Neither is the partition conducted on the basis of such literary criteria as diction and style. Mere scattered scraps are assigned to P, such as can be severed from the main body of the narrative, as entering least into its general flow and texture. The mass of the matter, as has uniformly been the case since ch. 23, is divided between J and E, which by confession of the critics can only be distinguished with the greatest difficulty. At times they are held to be inextricably blended; at other times arbitrary grounds of distinction are invented, such as assigning to E all dreams that are mentioned, or different incidents of the narrative are parcelled between them, as though they were varying accounts of the same thing, whereas they are distinct items in a complete and harmonious whole. Genealogical tables, dates, removals, deaths and legal transactions or ritual enactments are as a rule given to P. Historical narratives are attributed to J and E, and are divided between them not by any definite criteria of style, but by the artifice of imaginary doublets or arbitrary distinctions, leaving numerous breaks and unfilled gaps in their train. The method itself is sufficient to condemn the whole process and to show that the results are altogether factitious. It could be applied with equal plausibility and with like results to any composition, whatever the evidence of its unity.

SECTION 10. GEN. 37:2-41:57.

1. Critical Partition of Chapter 37.

No name of God occurs in this chapter. It has, however, been variously divided, and it affords a good illustration of the ease with which a narrative embracing several incidents can be partitioned at the pleasure of the critic. Knobel,

the latest and most minutely elaborate of the supplementary critics, recognizes in Genesis only an Elohist Primary Document, P, which gives a comparatively trustworthy statement of facts, and a Jehovist Reviser, J, who incorporates with the preceding the legendary embellishments of later times. P's account, vs. 1-4, 23, 27, 28 (from "and sold," etc.), 31, 32a, is that Joseph's reporting his brothers' misdeeds and his father's partiality for him so exasperated his brothers that they threw him into a pit, and then at Judah's instance sold him to Ishmaelites, who took him to Egypt; after this they dip Joseph's coat in blood and send it to their father. J adds from some other authority the prophetic dreams, Joseph's going in quest of his brothers, their conspiring against him, Reuben's proposal not to shed his blood but to put him in a pit (meaning, in the intent of the authority from which he draws, to let him perish there; but by inserting v. 22b, J converts this into a purpose to restore him to his father, and further introduces in the same vein vs. 29, 30, Reuben's subsequent distress at not finding Joseph in the pit). J makes no mention of the adoption of Reuben's proposal, but this is to be presumed as Midianites pass, who draw Joseph out of the pit and sell him to Potiphar. Finally Jacob's grief is depicted at the sight of his son's coat, which was sent him.

The reigning critical fashion finds three documents in Genesis, P, J and E, though this chapter is parcelled between J and E, leaving to P only an insignificant fragment at the beginning. Vatke gives the entire chapter to E except one interpolation from J, vs. 25-27, and one clause of v. 28, (and soldsilver), which records the sale to the Ishmaelites as proposed by Judah. According to E, Joseph was carried off by the Midianites, who chanced to find him in the pit into which his brothers had thrown him. It does not appear from J that Joseph was ever put in a pit at all. So also Gramberg views the case from his peculiar division of the chapter, connecting v. 25 directly with v. 23; the brothers dissemble their spite against Joseph and sit down to their food, when they spy the Ishmaelites coming and resolve to sell him to them. Schrader enlarges the interpolation from J by vs. 23, 24, 31-35 with the effect of transferring the statement of Joseph's being put in the pit and of his father's grief from E to J. This still leaves the whole of the narrative prior to v. 23 with E, and nothing in J respecting the relation of Joseph to his brothers until suddenly, without a word of explanation, they are found deliberating whether to kill him or to sell him as a slave.

Wellhausen is too acute a critic and too ingenious in discovering doublets to suffer this state of affairs to continue. He remarks, *Comp. d. Hex.*, p. 53: "Verses 12-24 are preparatory to vs. 25sq., and are indispensable for both E and J. To be sure no certain conclusion can be drawn from this alone as to its composite character, but a presumption is created in its favor which is confirmed by actual traces of its being double." Acting upon this presumption he sets him-

self to work to discover the traces. It seems to him that "Here am I" is not the proper answer to what Israel says to Joseph, v. 13; and that v. 18 does not fit in between vs. 17 and 19. "They saw him afar off" implies that he had not yet "found them;" and "they conspired against him to slay him" is a parallel to v. 20. Verses 21 and 22 are also doublets, only instead of "Reuben" in v. 21 we should read "Judah," whose proposal is to cast him into the pit, v. 20, to perish without killing him themselves, while Reuben, v. 22, has the secret purpose of rescuing him. From these premises he concludes that while J is the principal narrator in this paragraph, as shown by Israel, v. 13, Hebron v. 14, and verbal suffixes *passim*, nevertheless 13b, 14a, 18, 22 and parts of vs. 23, 24, in which **אתו** repeatedly occurs instead of a suffix attached to the verb, belong to E and represent his parallel narrative.

In vs. 2b-11 he is less successful in discovering traces of twofold authorship. These verses are attributed to E, who deals more largely with dreams than J, and who, moreover, has **בן זקנים**, v. 3 as 21:2 against **ילד זקנים** 44:20 J; **כתנת**, v. 3, as vs. 23, 32 against **כתנת** J, and especially has **אתו** constantly, vs. 4, 5, 8, 9, instead of a verbal suffix in marked contrast with vs. 12sq. "With the sons of Bilhah," etc., v. 2, does not accord accurately with the preceding clause, and "he told it to his father and to his brethren," v. 10, deviates from the statement in v. 9; but he thinks these to be additions by a later hand and not from J. He has, however, one resource; vs. 19, 20, J, speak of Joseph's dreams, consequently J must have given some account of them, though it has not been preserved.

Dillmann proves in this instance to have had sharper eyes than Wellhausen, and has found the desired doublets where the latter could discover none. To be sure he unceremoniously sets aside Wellhausen's criteria. He gives vs. 19, 20 to E (not J) in spite of repeated verbal suffixes which he will not recognize here as a discriminating mark, in spite, too, of **הלזה** which occurs 24:65 J, and nowhere else in the O. T.; and accordingly he does not allow the inference that J gave a parallel account of the dreams. But the coveted parallel is found by setting vs. 3, 4 as J's explanation of the hatred of Joseph over against that of E in vs. 5-11. According to J, his brothers hated him because he was his father's favorite; according to E, because of his ambitious dreams.* J says "they hated him," v. 4 **וִישְׂנָאוּ**; E, "they envied him," v. 11 **וִיקְנָאוּ**. To be sure **שנא** occurs twice over in the E paragraph, vs. 5, 8, and with explicit reference to v. 4, clearly indicating the identity of the writer. But if any one imagines that such a trifle as this can disturb a critic's conclu-

* Dillmann explains the allusion to Joseph's mother, 37:10, whose death is mentioned, 35:19, by his favorite method of transposition, assuming that the statement of her death in E really occurred after this time, but R for the sake of harmonizing with P, inserted it sooner. But it remains to be shown that Leah could not be referred to in this manner after Rachel's death.

sions, he is much mistaken. Dillmann blandly says that the unwelcome clauses were inserted by R, and lo! they disappear at once. The word of a critic is equal to the wand of a magician. When he says that v. 5b is inappropriate where it stands because the actual recital of the dream follows, vs. 6,7, Delitzsch reminds him that such anticipatory announcements are quite usual, and cites 2:8. He says the same of v. 8b, because only one dream had yet been told, forgetting the numerous examples of the generic use of the plural.* **כְּתַנַּת בֶּן זִקְנִים** , v. 3, which Wellhausen adduces as characteristic of E, become with Dillmann indicative of J. Knobel remarks that v. 7 and 26:12 are the only two passages in the Pentateuch, in which the patriarchs are spoken of as cultivating the soil or otherwise than as nomads; they should therefore be ascribed to the same hand. The critics lay stress upon a point like this when it suits them; otherwise they quietly ignore it. Dillmann gives v. 7 to E; 26:12 to J.

Dillmann further finds a foothold for J in v. 2, by insisting that 2a and 2b are mutually exclusive and that the former should be given to P or E, and the latter to J. Delitzsch cannot see why in point of matter they may not have proceeded from the same pen, while in grammatical construction Gen. 1:2,3 offers a precise parallel.

Critics are divided in opinion as to the share which is to be allowed P in 37:2. By common consent they assign him the initial words "These are the generations of Jacob," i. e., an account of Jacob's family from the time of his father's death; and thus we have a P title to a J and E section. The majority also refer to him the following clause, "Joseph was seventeen years old," with or without the rest of the sentence, which then becomes utterly unmeaning and is out of connection with anything whatever. The only reason for thus destroying its sense by severing it from the narrative to which it belongs is the critical assumption that all dates must be attributed to P. But Nöldeke himself revolts at the rigorous enforcement of this rule. He says,† "The mention of the youthful age of Joseph suits very well in the whole connection as well as that of his manly age, Gen. 41:46, and of the advanced age which he attained, Gen. 50:26. These numbers also have no connection whatever with the chronological system of the Primary Document (P) any more than the twenty years' abode in Mesopotamia," Gen. 31:38,41.

It will not be necessary to proceed with the recital of the varying divisions of Kuenen, Kittell and Kautzsch, which are sufficiently indicated, p. 2.‡ The critics themselves have shown how variously the same narrative may be divided. And it must be a very intractable material indeed that can resist the persistent application of such methods as the critics freely employ. The fact that different

* Cf. Gen. 8:4; 13:12; 21:7; Num. 26:8; Judg. 12:7; 1 Sam. 17:43; Job 17:1.

† *Untersuchungen zur Kritik d. Alt. Test.*, p. 32.

‡ References not otherwise specified are to previous numbers of HEBRAICA.

versions of a story can be constructed out of a narrative by an ingenious partition of its constituent elements by no means proves its composite character. They may be purely subjective, destitute of any historical basis, and of no more value than any clever trick at cross-reading.

It is alleged, however, that there are certain glaring inconsistencies in this chapter, which cannot be otherwise accounted for than as the fusing together of discordant narratives. Four discrepancies are charged.

1. Verses 21,22 it was Reuben, but v. 26 it was Judah, who persuaded the brothers not to put Joseph to death.

2. Verses 25,27,28, 39:1, Ishmaelites, but vs. 28,36, Midianites took Joseph and brought him to Egypt.

3. According to different clauses of v. 28, Joseph was carried off secretly without the knowledge of his brothers, or was sold by them.

4. Verse 36, he was sold to Potiphar, but 39:1 (purged of interpolations), to an unnamed Egyptian.

These imaginary difficulties are of easy solution.

As to the first. It surely is not surprising that two of the brothers should have taken an active part in the consultations respecting Joseph, nor that the same two should be prominent in the subsequent course of the transactions. Reuben, as the eldest, had special responsibilities and would naturally be forward to express his mind: while Judah's superior force of character, like that of Peter among the apostles, made him prompt to take the lead, and there is no inconsistency in what is attributed to them. Reuben persuaded them not to kill Joseph but to cast him alive into a pit, cherishing the purpose, which he did not divulge to them, to restore him to his father. They accede to his proposal intending to let Joseph die in the pit or to kill him at some future time. To this state of mind Judah addresses himself, v. 26. The absence of Reuben, when Joseph was sold, is not expressly stated, but is plainly enough implied in his despair and grief at his brother's disappearance. The reply which his brothers made is not recorded; but there is no implication that they were as ignorant as he of what had become of Joseph. That they had a guilt in the matter which he did not share is distinctly intimated, 42:22; he must, therefore, have been fully aware that they did something more than put Joseph in the pit at his suggestion.

As to the second point. Ishmaelites in the strict and proper sense were a distinct tribe from Midianites, and were of different though related origin. It is, however, a familiar fact, which we have had occasion to observe before, that tribal names are not always used with definite exactness, VI., p. 208. And there is explicit evidence that Ishmaelites was used in a wide sense to include Midianites, Judg. 8:24, cf. 7:1sq; 8:1sq. Dillmann's objection that this belonged to a later period comes with a bad grace from one who places the earliest Pentateuchal documents centuries after Gideon. The absence of the article before Midian-

ites, v. 28, does not imply that they were distinct from the Ishmaelites before perceived, vs. 25,27. They were recognized in the distance as an Ishmaelite caravan, but it was not till they actually came up to them that the Ishmaelites were discovered to be specifically Midianites.

As to the third point. If the first half of v. 28 were severed from its connection the words might mean that Midianites drew Joseph out of the pit. But in the connection in which it stands, such a sense is simply impossible. And the suggestion that R had two statements before him; one, that Midianites drew Joseph out of the pit without his brothers' knowledge and carried him off to Egypt; the other, that the brothers drew him from the pit and sold him to the Ishmaelites; is to charge him with inconceivable stupidity or reckless falsification. There can be no manner of doubt how the author of the book in its present form understood the transaction. There is no possible suggestion of more than one meaning in the words before us. The invention of another sense may illustrate the critic's wit, but it has no more merit than any other perversion of an author's obvious meaning. And it derives no warrant from 40:15; Joseph was "stolen away" even though his captors bought him from those who had no right to dispose of him.

The fourth point can be best considered when we come to ch. 39.

2. Chapter 38.

Because the narrative of Joseph is interrupted by ch. 38, De Wette* inferred "that we have here a compilation, not a continuous history by one narrator." The charge of displacement has been regularly repeated ever since,† though obviously unfounded. Chapter 38 is entirely germane to the subject treated, and it belongs precisely where it is in the author's plan. He is professedly giving an account of "the generations of Jacob," 37:2, not the life of Joseph simply, but the history of Jacob's family. Joseph is necessarily thrown into prominence since the events which brought about the removal of the chosen race to Egypt were so largely connected with him. But the incidents of this chapter have their importance in the constitution of Jacob's family at the time of the migration to Egypt, 46:12, and in the permanent tribal arrangements of Israel, Num. 26:19sq. The writer conducts Joseph to Egypt, where he is sold as a slave. There he leaves him for a while until these facts in Judah's family are related, when he resumes the thread of Joseph's narrative precisely where he left off and proceeds as before. It is just the method that the best writers pursue in similar circumstances. So far from suggesting confusion or disarrangement, it argues an orderly well-considered plan.

* *Beiträge*, II., p. 146.

† Page 2, note †; p. 3, note *; p. 4, note §; p. 6, 5. 1).

The chronological objection is equally futile. If Judah's marriage occurred shortly after Joseph was sold, as is expressly stated, there is no reason why all that is recorded in this chapter may not have taken place within the twenty-two years which preceded the migration to Egypt. It implies early marriages on the part of his sons but not incredibly early.

A further objection is thus stated, p. 6: "It is not to be overlooked that according to this chapter, the custom of the Levirate is very old, antedating by centuries the law recorded in Deuteronomy; P would not have been guilty of such an anachronism." Where, it may be asked, is the proof that there is an anachronism? Genesis shows that in several respects the laws of Moses embodied or were based upon patriarchal usages; while, nevertheless, the modifications show that there has been no transference to a primitive period of the customs of a later time. The penalty which Tamar was threatened, was not that of the Mosaic law, in which Dillmann admits a reminiscence of antelegal times. The critics claim that the Deuteronomic law belongs to the reign of Josiah, yet the Levirate was an established institution in the days of the judges, Ruth, 4:10. How much the argument from silence, of which critics make so frequent use, amounts to in this case, may be inferred from the fact that such marriages, though their existence is trebly vouched for, are nowhere alluded to in the other Pentateuchal codes nor in the later history until the times of the New Testament, Matt. 22:14. It is gratifying to note the admission that P would not commit an anachronism. He is not mistaken then, in speaking of circumcision in the family of Abraham as opposed to any critical inferences, V., p. 250, "that its existence as a custom would seem to date from Moses' days," nor in assigning the Levitical law to the wanderings in the wilderness, nor in his detailed description of the sacred tabernacle which cannot be the reflection from the temple of Solomon thrown back upon the Mosaic age.

The suggestion, p. 3, note, that the "general purpose of this chapter is to indicate the origin of the house of David" assumes that the writer adopted a very unusual method of flattering the pride of a royal house. How displeasing it was to national vanity appears from the fact that the Targum converts Judah's wife from the daughter of a Canaanite to that of a merchant and later legends make Tamar a daughter of Melchizedek.

3. Chapter 39.

The critical partition is here rested partly on the ground of alleged discrepancies, partly on that of diction. It is said that there are varying representations of the purchaser of Joseph. Was he, 37:36, Potiphar, the eunuch of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, or was he simply an Egyptian, whose name and official position, if he had any, are unknown? He is nowhere called Potiphar in this chapter except in v. 1, but only Joseph's master, v. 3, his Egyptian master, v. 2,

or the Egyptian, v. 5. And nothing is said, outside of v. 1, of his standing in any special relation to Pharaoh or holding any office under the king; but mention is made of "all that he had in the house and in the field," implying that he was the owner of a landed estate. It is hence inferred that the words "Potiphar, the eunuch of Pharaoh, captain of the guard," do not properly belong to v. 1, but were inserted by R to make it correspond with 37:36; and that originally it simply read "an Egyptian," words which would be superfluous, if his name and title had previously been given. But neither does "Potiphar" occur in ch. 40, where the critics admit that he is intended by Joseph's master, v. 7, see also vs. 3,4. Royal body guards are not always composed of native troops, so that it may not have been a matter of course that their captain was an Egyptian. Knobel thinks that the statement is made in contrast with the Hyksos origin of the monarch. Or it may emphasize the fact that Joseph was not only a slave but a slave of a foreigner; the Hebrew servant, vs. 14,17, had an Egyptian master. But no special reason is needed to justify the expression. Goliath "from Gath from the ranks of the Philistines" is further called "the Philistine," 1 Sam. 17:23, and throughout the chapter is always denominated "the Philistine," without repeating his name. That Potiphar was married creates no real difficulty. It is a disputed point whether סריס is invariably to be taken in the strict sense of eunuch or may sometimes have the general meaning of officer. However this may be, Winer* refers to Chardin, Niebuhr and Burckhardt in proof of the statement that "even in the modern orient eunuchs have sometimes kept a harem of their own." There is positively no ground, therefore, for assuming an interpolation in v. 1. And the explicit statement of that verse annuls the critical allegation of variant stories respecting the person of Joseph's master.

It is further said that Joseph's master is in 39:20,21 distinguished from the keeper of the prison into which Joseph was put; whereas in 40:3,4,7 they are identical. But the confusion here charged upon the text lies solely in the mind of the interpreters. The narrative is perfectly clear and consistent. The prison was in the house of Joseph's master, 40:7, the captain of the guard, v. 3, who had supreme control over it, v. 4; and this corresponds exactly with the representation, 39:20. Under him there was a subordinate keeper charged with its immediate oversight, 39:21, who was so favorably disposed towards Joseph that he committed all the prisoners into his hands and let him manage everything in the prison. This is neither identical with nor contradictory to the statement, 40:4, that the captain of the guard appointed Joseph to attend upon two prisoners of rank from the royal household. It has been said that he waited upon them simply as Potiphar's servant, and that ch. 40, E, knows nothing of Joseph's imprisonment related by J, ch. 39, and moreover uses the term מִשְׁמָר *ward*, 40:3,4,

* *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, Art. *Verschnittene*.

J, so 41:10 instead of **בית הסהר** *prison*, 39:20-23. But this result is only reached by expunging from the text without the slightest warrant every clause which directly declares the opposite, 40:3b,5b,15b; 41:14; cf. 39:20.

Wellhausen parcels the chapter between J and E, giving vs. 1-5,20-23 to the former on account of the repeated occurrence of **יהוה**, and vs. 6-19 to the latter because of **אלהים**, v. 9, (though this is the ordinary usage when Gentiles speak or are spoken to), and certain other expressions alleged to be characteristic of E. The result is that Joseph is in E falsely accused of a gross crime, but there is no intimation how the matter issues; and in J his master, who had the greatest confidence in him and was richly blessed for his sake, puts him in prison for no cause whatever. Wellhausen, moreover, finds traces of E in the J sections and of J in the E section. Dillmann admits the indivisible character of the chapter and refers the whole of it to J, but as the two following chapters are given to E, the consequence is that according to J, Joseph is put in prison and no information given how or why he was subsequently released; the next that we hear of him he is made viceroy of Egypt with no explanation of how it came to pass, see p. 10 (8) "How J brings Joseph before Pharaoh is not clear." The expressions commonly attributed to E, which are found in this chapter, are accounted for by Dillmann as insertions by R. This repeated occurrence of traces of one document in the limits of the other, and the allegation that the documents have been in various particulars modified by R, are simply confessions that the text is not what by the critics' hypothesis it ought to be. Words and phrases held to be characteristic of J or E in one place are perversely found in the wrong document in another place. So without revising and correcting their own previous conclusions and adjusting their hypothesis to the phenomena as they find them, the critics insist that the document itself is wrong, and who can there be to blame for it but R?

The following expressions regarded as characteristic of E, nevertheless occur in the J text of this chapter:

<p>Verse 4, אתו וישרת אתו as 40:4; Ex. 24:13; 33:11, repeatedly also in P; v. 6, יפה תאר ויפה מראה as 29:17; v. 7, הרברים האלה as 15:1; 22:1; 40:1; 48:1; v. 21, חננו בעיני as Ex. 3:21; 11:3. Varying constructions as הפקיר</p>	<p>in vs. 4,5, and of מצליח trans. v. 2, but intrans. vs. 3,23 would be held to indicate different writers if they occurred in distinct sections. The diffuseness in v. 1, vs. 2-6, vs. 21-23 is such as is elsewhere claimed to be a mark of P.</p>
--	---

4. Chapter 40.

This chapter and the two that follow are by the critics referred to E. Dillmann gives the following reasons in the case of ch. 40: "the dreams," but it is arbitrarily assumed that all dreams must belong to E, see VI., p. 171; "vs. 3a,4 presuppose Joseph not in prison as ch. 39, but the slave of the captain of the guard as 37:36; 41:12." Nothing is said or implied at variance with his imprisonment, which is explicitly affirmed, vs. 3b,15b. "I was stolen away," v. 15,

is not inconsistent with his being sold by his brothers; "the connection of ch. 41 with 40," is readily conceded, but involves no discrepancy with or separation from ch. 39. He offers no argument from language but "the avoidance of the verbal suffix, which distinguishes E from J," quietly ignoring the fact that he refused to admit this criterion in ch. 37. **אלהים** v. 8, is spoken to Gentiles; "and it came to pass after these things" cannot be claimed for E, 40:1, after having been given to J, 39:7. That vs. 1,5 have "the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt," while the rest of the chapter has "chief butler," "chief baker" and "Pharaoh," is no good reason for affirming that the former are insertions by R, when v. 1 is indispensable as supplying the reason for v. 2, and the office of the chief butler is simply called "butlership" **משקה**, v. 21. It can scarcely be thought that such arguments are of any weight in favor of critical division.

Nor is there an anachronism in the phrase "land of the Hebrews," v. 15. "Abram the Hebrew," was the head of a powerful clan, 14:13,14, recognized as such by native tribes of Canaan, 23:6, and his friendship sought by the king of the Philistines, 21:22sq. Isaac's greatness is similarly described, 26:13sq., 28sq. The prince and the people of Shechem were willing to submit to circumcision for the sake of friendly intercourse and trade with Jacob, and Jacob's sons avenged the wrong done their sister by the destruction of the city, ch. 34. The Hebrews had been in Canaan for two centuries and their presence was influential and widely known. There is nothing strange, therefore, in the fact that Potiphar's wife calls Joseph a Hebrew, 39:14,17, or that he could speak of the country whence he came as the land of the Hebrews.

5. Chapter 41.

The reasons alleged by Dillmann for assigning this chapter to E are the significant dreams which are of no more weight than those in ch. 40. Joseph is called "servant to the captain of the guard," v. 12, but he was also a prisoner, v. 14, which is evaded after the usual critical fashion, by erasing from the text the words "and they brought him hastily out of the dungeon" as an insertion from a hypothetical parallel of J; but even then his shaving himself and changing his raiment are an allusion to his prison attire, or why are not the same things mentioned when others are presented before the king? The references to ch. 40 (41:10-13, cf. 40:1sq.; 41:16, cf. 40:8), and unusual words common to both chapters (**פֶּתֶרֶן**, **כֵּן**, **פֶּתֶרֶן**, **קֶצֶף**, **station**, **קֶצֶף**) point to the same author, but in no way imply that he was not the author of ch. 39 and 43 as well; **אלהים** in vs. 16,25,32,38,39 is in language addressed to Pharaoh or used by him; vs. 51,52 are the only instances in which **יְהוָה** could with any propriety be substituted for it, and even there **אלהים** is equally appropriate, for the reference is to God's providential blessings, such as men in general may share rather than to specific favor granted to one of the chosen race; **בלערי**, vs. 16,44, but once beside in Genesis,

14:24, referred by Dillmann to E, but by the majority of critics to an independent source, and twice more in the Hex., Num. 5:20; Josh. 22:19, P. The arguments for considering this chapter a part of the document E are accordingly lame and impotent enough.

We are further informed that this chapter is not a unit as it stands. It is essential for the critics to establish, if possible, the existence of a parallel narrative by J, which may have filled the gap in that document between Joseph's imprisonment and his elevation. Accordingly stress is laid upon some slight verbal changes in repeating Pharaoh's dreams, especially the words added to the description of the lean kine, v. 19, "such as I never saw in all the land of Egypt for badness," and v. 21, "when they had eaten up the fat kine, it could not be known that they had eaten them; but they were still illflavored as at the beginning." And a vigorous search is made for so-called doublets. Wherever the writer does not content himself with a bald and meagre statement of what he is recording, but feels impelled to enlarge and dwell upon it in order to give his thought more adequate expression, the amplifications or repetitions which he employs are seized upon as though they were extraneous additions imported into E's original narrative by R from an imaginary parallel account by J, just as a like fulness of expression in other passages is at the pleasure of the critics declared to be indicative of the verbose and repetitious style of P.

The dreams vs. 2-7 are repeated, vs. 18-24 in almost identical terms, only in a very few instances equivalent expressions are employed, viz.: *וַיֹּאמֶר* v. 18sq. for *מָרָאָה* v. 2sq. (but see 29:17 E, 39:6 J); *רָךְ* v. 19 for *רַק* v. 3; *מְלֵא* v. 22 for *בָּרִיא* v. 5 (but see v. 7). The alleged doublets are, v. 31, parallel to v. 30b; v. 34 *וַיַּעֲשֶׂה* to *וַיַּפְקֵד*; 35b to 35a; vs. 41,43b,44 to v. 40 (Joseph's rule is stated four times, so that repetition cannot be escaped by parcelling it between E and J); v. 49 to v. 48; vs. 55,56a to 54b (the universality of the famine repeated three times including 57b). While it is claimed

that these indicate two narrators, Dillmann admits that there are no criteria by which to distinguish which is E and which J. The further occurrence of words in this chapter which according to critical rules should belong to P, e. g., *וַיִּרְאֵם* vs. 8,24 in the Pentateuch besides only Ex. 7:11,22; 8:3,14,15; 9:11, all P; *וַיַּקְרֵן* in O. T. besides only Lev. 5:21,23, P; *וַיִּקְרַן* v. 47 in O. T. besides only Lev. 2:2; 5:12; 6:8, and the corresponding verb only Lev. 2:2; 5:12; Num. 5:26, all P, leads one to doubt the value of criteria in other cases which the critics can thus disregard at pleasure.

On the whole, then, the critical partition of chs. 37-41 rests upon alleged inconsistencies in the narrative which plainly do not exist as the text now stands, but which the critics themselves create by arbitrary erasures and forced interpretations. The literary proof offered of the existence of different documents is of the scantiest kind. There are no indications of varying diction of any account. And the attempt to bridge the chasms in the documents by means of a supposed parallel narrative, from which snatches have been preserved by R, attributes an unaccountable procedure to him, and falls to pieces at once upon examination.

There are three staple arguments, by which the critics attempt to show that there was in the sources, from which R is conjectured to have drawn, a second

narrative parallel to that in the existing text. Each of them is built upon a state of facts antagonistic to the hypothesis, which they ingeniously seek to wrest in its favor by assuming the truth of the very thing to be proved.

1. Facts, which are essential to the narrative, could not, it is said, have failed to appear in either document; it must be presumed, therefore, that each narrator recorded them.

But the perpetual recurrence of such serious gaps in the so-called documents, which the critics are by every device laboring to construct, tends rather to show that no such documents ever really had any separate existence. That these gaps are due to omissions by R is pure assumption with no foundation but the unproved hypothesis which it is adduced to support; an assumption, moreover, at variance with the conduct repeatedly attributed to R in other places, where to relieve other complications of the hypothesis he is supposed to have scrupulously preserved unimportant details from one of his sources, even though they were superfluous repetitions of what had already been extracted from another.

2. When words and phrases, which the critics regard as characteristic of one document, are found, as they frequently are, in sections which they assign to the other, it is claimed that R has mixed the texts of the different documents.

But the obvious and natural conclusion from the fact referred to is, that what are affirmed to be characteristic words of different documents, are freely used by the same writer. The allegation that R had anything to do with the matter, is an assumption which has no other basis than the hypothesis which it is brought to support. It is plain that any conceit whatever could be carried through successfully, if every deviation from its requirements was sufficiently explained by referring it to R.

3. Whenever a thought is repeated or dwelt upon for the sake of giving it more emphatic expression, the critics scent a doublet, affirming that R has appended to the statement in one document the corresponding statement contained in the other.

But here again the agency of R is pure assumption based on the hypothesis in whose interest it is alleged. That a writer should use more amplitude and fullness in describing matters of special moment is quite intelligible. But why a compiler like R should encumber the narrative by reduplicating what he has already drawn from one source by the equivalent language of another, or why, if this is his method in the instances adduced, he does not consistently pursue it in others, it does not appear.

What are so confidently paraded as traces or indications of some missing portion of a critical document are accordingly rather to be esteemed indications that the documents of the critics are a chimera.

1. LANGUAGE OF P.*

OLD WORDS.

(1) אלה תלדות see V., p. 152.

The following words not in the list VI., p. 2, might with propriety have been urged as belonging to P by critical rules.

דָּבָר, 37:2, only besides in Hex., Num. 13:32; 14:36, 37 P.

דִּבֶּר, with acc. pers., 37:4, only besides Num. 26:3 P.

שָׁעִיר עִזִּים, 37:31, only besides in Hex. in the ritual law, where it occurs repeatedly, Lev. 4:23; 9:3; 16:5; 23:9; Num. chs. 7, 15, 28, 29; nowhere else in O. T., except Ezek. 43:22; 45:23, where it is borrowed from the Pentateuch.

41:50 has the same fulness of expression which in 16:15; 21:3 is said to be a mark of P.

2. LANGUAGE OF J.*

OLD WORDS.

(1) נָשָׂא עֵינָיִם וְגו' explained above under Section 5, Language of J. (2) בָּשָׂר (=relative) Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (3) וְתָהָר V., p. 155, (35). (4) יָכַף Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (5) רָע בְּעֵינַי Sect. 6, Lang. of E. (6) לִבְלָתִי V., p. 155. (7) הִכָּה Sect. 4, Lang. of J. (8) נָא Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (9) יְהוּה see Preliminary Remarks, No. 3. (10) נָוִי Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (11) צָעִיף Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (12) אִיהָ V., p. 155. (13) כִּי-עַל-כֵּן always referred to J. (14) פֶּן V., p. 155. (15) אֲנֹכִי repeatedly in both J and E and once in P, V., p. 174, 6:17. (16) פָּרַץ Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (17) מִצְלִיחַ Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (18) מִצָּא V., p. 175, 6:5-8. (19) בָּגַל Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (20) חֹרֶה Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (21) חָשַׁב 15:6; 38:15 J; 31:15; 50:20; Num. 23:9 E; Lev. 7:18; 17:4; 25:27, 31, 50, 52; 27:18, 23; Num. 18:27, 30 P, besides occurring frequently in P in a derived sense. (22) חָשַׁךְ 39:9 J; 20:6; 22:12 E; 22:16 R; all in Hex. (23) יִפְה־מְרָאָה 12:11; 39:6 J; 29:17; 41:24 E; all in Hex. (24) תִּפְשׁ 4:21 J; 39:12; Josh. 8:8, 23 J; Num. 5:13; 31:27 P; all in Hex. except Deuteronomy.

NEW WORDS.

(1) טָרַף 37:33bis; 44:28bis; 49:27 J; Ex. 22:12 E. Derivatives טָרַף adj., Gen. 8:11 J; טָרַף (poetic) Gen. 49:9 J; Num. 23:24 E; טָרַפָּה

Gen. 31:39; Ex. 22:12, 30 E; Lev. 7:24; 17:15; 22:8 P.

(2) נָכַר HI. recognize, 37:32, 33; 38:25, 26 J; 27:23; 31:32; Deut. 33:9 E; 42:7, 8bis, the critics give v. 7 to J, v. 8 to E.

RARE AND POETIC WORDS.

Words that a writer scarcely ever uses afford of course no indication of his ordinary style.

(1) נָטָה עַר 38:1 this construction does not occur again in O. T.

(2) פָּתַח עֵינָיִם 38:14; the "entrance to Enaim" does not chance to be spoken of elsewhere, but פָּתַח is of repeated occurrence in J, E and P; it is used precisely as here, Josh. 20:4 P.

(3) הִתְעַלֶּף 38:14; nowhere else in O. T. in this sense.

(4) עֲרֹבוֹן 38:17, 18, 20; nowhere else in O. T.

(5) בֵּית הַסֹּהֵר 39:20, 21, 22, 23 J; 40:3, 5 claimed to be insertions from J in an E context; nowhere else in O. T.

(6) הִתְנַכַּל 37:18; nowhere else in Hex.; the Prél occurs Num. 25:18 P.

(7) אֶרְחָה 37:25; nowhere else in Hex.

(8) זִנוּנִים 38:24; nowhere else in Hex.

(9) בָּצַע 37:26 J; Ex. 18:21 E; all in Hex.

(10) קִרְשָׁה 38:21bis, 22; all in Hex. except Deut. 23:18.

3. LANGUAGE OF E.*

OLD WORDS.

How utterly the critics have failed to make out a separate diction for E appears from the fact that every one of these words with a solitary exception occurs likewise in J or P: and

the great majority of them have been previously adduced as characteristic of J.

(1) חָלוֹם is by rule referred to E, yet it occurs Num. 12:6 J (according to Dillmann) Sect. 6, Lang. of E. (2) נָא see Lang. of J (immedi-

* The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, Vol. VI., No. I, and the following references are to explanations already made.

ately preceding) No. 8. (3) אָנְכִי Lang. of J, No. 15. (4) טָרַם V., p. 155, Lang. of J. (5) הָלוּהָ 37:19 E; 24:65 J; all in O. T. (6) שָׁלַח יָד Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (7) אֱלֹהִים see Preliminary Remarks, No. 3. (8) כָּדוּעַ Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (9) שִׁים V., p. 154, Lang. of J; שִׁית 41:33; 46:4 E; 3:15; 4:25; 30:40; 48:14,17, J, all in Genesis; besides other passages it is found in Ex. 7:23, which Dillmann refers to E, Jülicher to J, and Wellhausen to P. (10) בָּלַעְרִי 41:16, 44 E; 14:24 E (Dillmann), but other critics an independent source; Num. 5:20; Josh. 22:19 P. (11) בַּתְּחֻלָּה Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (12) רָק Sect. 3, Lang. of J, 6:5-8. (13) כָּחוּל הַיָּם 41:49 E section, though Kautzsch and others cut out this clause and give it to J; 22:17 R or J; 32:13 J; Josh. 11:4 D; all in Hex. (14) חָדַל 23:5; 41:49 E; 11:8; 18:11; Ex. 9:29,33,34; 14:12 J; Num. 9:13 P. (15) תַּעֲקֶה 20:13; 21:14; 37:15; Ex. 23:4, Sect. 6, Lang. of E. Absolutely the only one in this entire number, which happens not to be found in any but an E section. (16) אָפַה 37:16 E, nowhere else so spelled in Hex., as אָפֹא see Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (17) יַפֶּת מְרֹאֶה 29:17; 41:2,4 E; 12:11; 39:16 J. (18) פָּעַם V., p. 155, Lang. of J; פָּעַמָּים in Hex. only 27:36; 43:10 J; Num. 20:11 E, where Dillmann suspects that it was inserted by R.

NEW WORDS.

(1) בָּקַשׁ 31:39; 37:15,16; Ex. 10:11; 33:7 E; 43:9,30; Ex. 2:15; 4:24 J; Ex. 4:19 J (Dillmann), E (Wellhausen); Josh. 2:22 JE; Josh. 22:23 R; Lev. 19:31; Num. 16:10; 35:23 P.
(2) מִרְחוּק 22:4; 37:18; Ex. 2:4; 20:21; 24:1 E; Ex. 20:18 J (Dillmann).
(3) הִצִּיל 31:9,16; 37:22; Ex. 3:8; 5:23; 18:4,8, 9,10bis; Josh. 9:26; 24:10 E; 32:12; 37:21; Ex. 2:19; 12:27 J; Josh. 2:13 JE; Ex. 6:6; Num. 35:25; Josh. 22:31 P.

(4) מָאֵן Ex. 22:16bis; Num. 20:21; 22:13,14 E; Gen. 37:35; 39:8; 48:19; Ex. 4:23; 7:14; 10:3; 16:28 J; adjective, Ex. 7:27; 9:2; 10:4 J.
(5) שָׂאֵל 37:35; 42:38; 44:29,31; Num. 16:30, 33 J.
(6) קָרִים 41:6,23,27 E; Ex. 10:13bis; 14:21 J.
(7) עָמַל 41:51 E; Num. 23:21 E (Dillmann), J (Wellhausen).
(8) שָׁכַר trade in grain, 41:56,57; 43:2,3,5,10 E; 42:6,7; 43:2,4,20,22; 44:25; 47:14 J.
(9) נָכוֹן 41:32; Ex. 8:22; 19:11,15 E; Ex. 34:2; Josh. 8:4 J.
(10) אָשַׁכַּל 40:10; Num. 13:23,24 E; Deut. 32:32 J.

RARE AND POETIC WORDS.

(1) פָּתְרוֹן 40:5,8,12,18; 41:11 E; all in O. T.
(2) שָׁחַט 40:11 E; all in O. T.
(3) צִנּוּמוֹת 41:23 E; all in O. T.
(4) חָמֵשׁ 41:34 E; all in O. T.
(5) אֲכָרַךְ 41:43 E; all in O. T.
(6) קָמִץ 41:47 E; so Fuerst, but according to Gesen. קָמִץ, Lev. 2:2; 5:12; 6:8 P, from קָמַץ, Lev. 2:2; 5:12; Num. 5:26 P.
(7) אֵלֶם blind 37:7 E; אֶלְמָה 37:7 (four times) all in Hex.
(8) אָחוּ 41:2,18 E; all in Hex.
(9) זָעַרְף 40:6 E; all in Hex.
(10) שָׁרִיג 40:10,12; all in Hex.
(11) קָן post 40:13; 41:13 E; with slightly modified sense applied to the base or support of the laver, Ex. 30:18 and repeatedly in P.
(12) בְּרִיא 41:2,4,5,7,18,20 E; all in Hex.
(13) שָׂרַף 41:6,23,27 E; all in Hex.
(14) פָּעַם (with רוּחַ) 41:8 E; all in Hex.
(15) רוּץ Hl. 41:14 E; all in Hex.
(16) שָׁנָה (as verb) 41:32 E; all in Hex.
(17) נָשָׂה 41:51 E; all in Hex.
(18) רָבַד 41:42 E; all in Hex.

SECTION XI. GENESIS 42:1-46:34.

1. Chapter 42-44.

The critics tell us that ch. 42, which records the first journey of Jacob's sons to Egypt is by E, and chs. 43, 44, their second journey is by J. Yet the second journey implies the first and is filled throughout with numerous and explicit allusions to it. It was, 43:2, after they had eaten up the corn already brought

that their father urged them to go again. All then, turns upon Joseph's having required them to bring Benjamin, vs. 3-11. Repeated reference is made to the money returned in their sacks, vs. 12,15,18-23; 44:8, and to Simeon's detention, vs. 14,23. Jacob's sense of bereavement, v. 14, corresponds with previous statements, 42:36; 37:34,35. Joseph speaks of their father and youngest brother, of whom they had previously told him, vs. 27-29. They bow before him in fulfilment of his dreams, vs. 26,28. Joseph orders their money to be replaced in their sacks, 44:1, as before. And Judah's touching address to Joseph, 44:18-34, recites anew the circumstances of their former visit together with their father's grief at the loss of Joseph. It is difficult to see how two parts of the same narrative could be more closely bound together.

Nevertheless it is maintained that all these allusions to what took place in the former journey are not to the record given of it in ch. 42, but to a quite different narrative; that a careful consideration of chs. 43, 44 will show that they are not the sequel of ch. 42, but of a parallel account by J, which no longer exists indeed, inasmuch as R did not think fit to preserve it, but which can be substantially reconstructed from the hints and intimations in these chapters themselves, and must have varied from that of E in several particulars. R is here as always the scape goat on whose head these incongruities are laid, though no very intelligible reason can be given why he should have constructed this inimitable history in such a disjointed manner. And it is likewise strange that the discrepancies between the two narratives so strenuously urged by Wellhausen and Dillmann seem to have escaped the usually observant eye of Hupfeld, who makes no mention of them. As Ilgen, De Wette and Gramberg had raised the same difficulties before, Hupfeld's silence can only mean that he did not deem them worth repeating. Knobel, though ready enough to undertake a critical division elsewhere, insists upon the unity of chs. 42-45, and maintains that the charge of inconsistencies is unfounded. The same judgment, one would think, must be formed by any candid person. The alleged discrepancies are the following:

1. In J, 43:3, it is Judah, whereas in E, 42:37, it is Reuben, who becomes surety for Benjamin's safe return.

But these do not exclude each other. Why should not more than one of Jacob's sons have sought to influence him in a case of such extreme importance to them all? If Reuben had pleaded without effect, why should not Judah renew the importunity, as the necessity became more urgent? It is here precisely as with the separate proposals of Reuben and Judah, 37:21,26, which, as we have seen, the critics likewise seek, without reason, to array against each other. Reuben's allusion, 42:23, to his interference in that instance implies that his remonstrance was not heeded, and that his brothers were responsible for Joseph's death, which he sought to prevent. As the critics represent the matter this was not the case. At Reuben's instance they put Joseph in a pit instead of shedding his

blood. Now if, as the critics will have it, Midianite merchants found him there and carried him off in the absence of the brothers, the latter had no more to do with his disappearance than Reuben had. Reuben's unresisted charge that the rest were guilty of Joseph's death, in which he was not himself implicated, finds no explanation upon the critics' version of the story. It is only when the sundered parts of the narrative are brought together, and it is allowed to stand in its complete and proper form, that Joseph was sold to the Ishmaelites at the suggestion of Judah, while Reuben supposed him to be still in the pit, that his words have any meaning. No difficulty is created by Reuben's speaking of his blood as required. The brothers imagined him to be no longer living. Judah, who counselled the sale, speaks of him as dead, 44:20. By selling him into bondage, they had as they thought procured his death.

It is further claimed that

2. J knows nothing of Simeon's detention related by E, 42:19,24. Judah nowhere alluded to it in arguing with his father, 43:3-10, when he might have urged the prospect of releasing Simeon as an additional reason for their speedy return; nor does he refer to it in his address to Joseph, 44:18-34.

But the supreme interest on both these occasions centered about Benjamin. Would his father consent to let him go? Would Joseph allow him to return to his father? These were the questions quite apart from the case of Simeon, so that in dealing with them there was no occasion to allude to him. But Simeon is directly spoken of twice in ch. 43. When Jacob is starting them on their return he prays, v. 14, "God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he release unto you *your other brother* and Benjamin." And, v. 23, when they reach the house of Joseph, the steward "brought Simeon out unto them." These explicit allusions to Simeon's imprisonment are evaded by declaring them to be interpolations from E. The argument for suppressing them may be fairly stated thus: because Simeon is not referred to where there is no occasion for speaking of him, therefore the mention which is made of him in the proper place cannot be an integral part of the text. In other words, whatever the critics desire to eliminate from a passage, is eliminated without further ceremony by declaring it spurious. If it does not accord with their theory, that is enough; no other proof is necessary.

The further allegation that 42:38 is not the direct reply to v. 37, because Simeon is not spoken of in it, is futile on its face; for as Reuben makes no allusion to him in his proposal, there is no reason why Jacob should do so in his answer. Nevertheless the critics tell us that E's narrative is abruptly broken off at 42:37 and left incomplete. No response is made to Reuben at all; and we have no means of knowing whether Jacob acceded to his request, or on what terms. Instead of this R introduces an irrelevant verse (v. 38) from J, which in its original connection was a reply to something quite distinct from the words by

which it is here preceded. All this confusion (where in reality no confusion exists) is created by the critical necessity of assigning v. 38 to J since the words "if mischief befall him, ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave" are identical with 44:29,31 and must obviously be from the same writer.

3. "In ch. 42 Joseph will by detaining Simeon, compel the brothers at all events to come back again with or without Benjamin; in ch. 43sq., on the contrary, he forbids them to come back, if Benjamin is not with them. In ch. 42 they are treated as spies, at first they are all put in prison together and then only set free on bail to bring Benjamin, and thus confirm the truth of their declarations; but in ch. 43sq., they do not go back to Egypt from the moral obligation of clearing themselves and releasing Simeon, but wait till the corn is all gone and the famine constrains them. The charge that they were spies was not brought against the brothers at all according to 43:5-7; 44:18sqq.; it was not this which induced them, as in ch. 42, to explain to Joseph, who and whence they really were, and thus involuntarily to make mention of Benjamin, but Joseph directly asked them, Is your father yet alive? have ye another brother? and then commanded them not to come into his presence again without him."*

All this is only an attempt to create a conflict where there is none. One part of a transaction is set in opposition to another equally belonging to it. One motive is arrayed against another, as though they were incompatible, when both were alike operative. When Joseph told his brothers that they must verify their words by Benjamin's coming or be considered spies, 42:15,16,20,34, he in effect told them that they should not see his face again unless Benjamin was with them. They delay their return until the corn was all used up, because nothing less than imminent starvation will induce Jacob, who has already lost two sons, to risk the loss of his darling. That Joseph directly interrogated them about their father and brother is not expressly said in ch. 42; but as the entire interview is not narrated, there is nothing to forbid it. The critics do not themselves insist on the absolute conformity of related passages unless they have some end to answer by it. The words of Reuben as reported 42:22 are not identical with those ascribed to him 37:22; and nothing is said in ch. 37 of Joseph's beseeching his brothers in the anguish of his soul, as 42:21. Jacob's sons "in rehearsing their experience to their father...omit his first proposition to keep all of them but one and their three days' imprisonment, and add that if they prove true, he would offer them the trade of Egypt."† Judah, in relating the words of his father, 44:27-29, does not limit himself to language which, according to 43:2sq., he uttered on the occasion referred to. In these instances the critics find no discrepancies within the limits of the same document but count it sufficient that the general sense is pre-

* Wellhausen, *Comp. d. Hexateuchs*, p. 56.

† VI., p. 15.

served. If they would but interpret with equal candor elsewhere their imaginary difficulties would all melt away.

4. A discrepancy is alleged regarding the money found in the sacks. According to 43:21 J, the discovery was made at the lodging on their way home, but according to 42:35 E, after their arrival home and in the presence of their father.

It is to be observed, however, that these are not variant statements of the historian. In the former passage he is repeating what the brothers said to Joseph's steward, which makes a material difference. The historian's own account of the matter clears up the difficulty entirely. One of the brothers, on opening his sack at the lodging, 42:27sq., found his money and reported the fact to the rest, whereat they were greatly alarmed. But it was not until they emptied their sacks after reaching home, v. 35, that they and their father ascertained to their alarm and to his that each of them had brought his money back. In making their apology subsequently to Joseph's steward, it was of no consequence for them to relate in detail just when and where these successive discoveries were made. The one important fact was that they all found their money in their sacks, and they link this with the first discovery, which so excited them at the lodging. Their statement, though not minutely accurate, was yet for their purpose substantially true.

The critics, however, refuse to accept this obvious explanation. They claim that 42:27,28 does not belong to E's narrative, but has been inserted by R from an assumed parallel account by J. If these verses are excluded from E's text, he makes no mention of any discovery at the lodging. J alone speaks of money being found there; according to E, they first find their money all together at home. It is further alleged, 42:27,28 has been altered by R. In its original form as a part of J's text, it must have corresponded with 43:21, and have stated that not one of the brothers merely but all of them found their money in their sacks at the lodging. If one opened his sack to give his ass provender, must not the rest have done the same and made the same discovery? and especially as they were so agitated by the fact that one had found his money in his sack, would not the rest have made instant search in theirs? But all this conjectural reasoning does not change the fact. The statement of the history is that one found his money at the lodging and all found theirs when they reached home. Whether both these items belong to the same document or not, there is no conflict between them. And the critics can scarcely be accorded the privilege of changing the text *ad libitum* for the sake of creating a discrepancy where there is none and thus manufacturing an argument for variant narratives and separate documents.

An argument is brought from the language of these verses to confirm these critical assertions; but it is altogether inconclusive.

According to Dillmann האחר 42:27 means *the first* in order, implying that the rest subsequently did the same; it rather denotes *the one* who performed the action referred to, definitely conceived as 2 Kgs. 6:3,5. It is claimed that the language of these verses is that of J, as shown by מספוא, מלון, אמתחת, אמתחת מספוא fodder and מלון lodging-place are the proper words to express these ideas and cannot be regarded as characterizing any particular writer. The former is used four times in the Hex., twice in this narrative, 42:27; 43:24, and twice in the story of Abraham's servant, 24:25,32. The latter also occurs twice in this narrative, 42:27; 43:21, and in two passages besides in the Hex., Ex. 4:24; Josh. 4:3,8. More stress is laid on אמתחת sack, a word peculiar to this narrative, which is claimed for J, while E's word for the same is שק. The latter properly denotes the coarse material from which sacks and the dress of mourners

were made, and is then applied to anything made of this material. אמתחת from מתח to *expand* is the specific term for a bag or sack. The grain sacks are first mentioned 42:25, where the general term כלי vessel is used together with שק; then in vs. 27,28 שק together with אמתחת; in v. 35 שק alone, and thenceforward אמתחת as the proper and specific term is steadfastly adhered to in the rest of the narrative throughout chs. 43 and 44. That this affords no argument for sundering vs. 27,28 from their present connection and assigning them to another writer is obvious, since both שק and אמתחת occur there together; moreover אלהים in the last clause of v. 28 forbids it being assigned to J. Dillmann evades these difficulties by assuming that these verses have been manipulated by R, who inserted שק and transposed the unwelcome clause from its original position after v. 35. What cannot a critic prove with the help of R?

Further proof that ch. 42 is from E and chs. 43, 44 from J is sought from the language of these chapters, but with no great success.

E calls Benjamin ילד 42:22, but J נער 43:8; 44:22-34. J, however, likewise calls him ילד 44:20, and uses the same word repeatedly elsewhere, e. g., 32:23; 33:1-14 (9 times), while E uses נער with equal frequency, 14:24; 21:12-20 (6 times), ch. 22 (5 times), etc., etc.

E says יעקב 42:1,4,29,36, but J ישראל 43:6,8, 11. Dillmann undertakes to carry consistently through the rule laid down by Wellhausen,* but which through the fault of R he admits has not been strictly observed,† viz., that after 35:10 J calls the patriarch Israel, E calls him Jacob, but his sons the sons of Israel, while P continues to speak of Jacob and the sons of Jacob. Whence results this curious circumstance; P 35:10 and E 32:29 (so Dill.) record the change of name to Israel but never use it; J alone makes use of it and he does not record the change at all. There is a singular inconsistency likewise in the conduct of R. P alone mentions the change in the names of Abraham and Sarah, 17:5,15, but R is so concerned to have the documents uniform in this respect

that from this point onward he alters these names in J and E to correspond with P; why does he not here in like manner bring P and E into correspondence with J? And it is only by palpable forcing that Dillmann succeeds in uniformly assigning ישראל to J; see e. g. 45:27,28; 46:1,2; 47:27; 48:2,8,11,21. Wellhausen, Kautzsch and other critics abandon the attempt as hopeless. At this period of transition when the family is branching out into the nation these two names seem to be used interchangeably, the distinction lying purely in the writer's point of view. The patriarch is called by his personal name Jacob when he is regarded strictly as an individual; he is called Israel when he is regarded as the head and representative of the chosen race, cf. 46:8.

E says שק, אמתחת for sack; explained above.

E says האיש אדני הארץ 42:30,33; J simply האיש 43:3,5,6,7,13,14; 44:26. The full phrase "the man, the lord of the land" was necessary at first in order to indicate the person in-

* *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 59.

† Page 60.

tended; its constant repetition afterwards would be cumbrous. In like manner "the man who was over Joseph's house," 43:16,19 is simply called "the man," v. 17. The plur. const. מַשְׁמֵר is used in a singular sense but once besides in the Pent., 39:20, where it is attributed to J.

E has מַשְׁמֵר 42:17,19 as 40:3,4,7; 41:10, while J has בֵּית הַסֵּהר 39:20-33; but the latter also occurs in an E context 40:3,5, only the clause containing it is cut out and assigned to J because of this very phrase.

E has the prolonged form of the fem. plur. suf. כְּלָנָה 42:36, as 21:29; 31:6; 41:21; but J has the same יְהִמְנֶה for יִחְמֶן 30:41.

צָרָה 42:25 E as 45:21; Josh. 9:11; but so J 27:3; Ex. 12:39; all in Hex. except Josh. 1:11 D.

צָרָה 42:21 *bis* E; but so J Deut. 31:17,21; all in Hex.

זָכַר 42:9 E as 40:14 *bis*, 23; 41:9; Ex. 20:8(?), 24; 23:13; but so J Ex. 13:3; 32:13; Lev. 26:42 (three times), 45(?); Num. 11:5; 15:39,40, and P 8:1; 9:15,16; 19:29; 30:22; Ex. 2:24; 6:5; Num. 5:15(?); 10:9(?); all in Pent. except Deut.

אָכַל is claimed for J, 43:2,4,20,22; 44:1,25 in distinction from כָּר E 41:35,49; 42:3,25; 45:23; but the former occurs in E 41:35 *bis*, 36,48 *bis*; 42:7,10; 47:24 unless the clauses containing it are arbitrarily severed from their context.

יָרַר and הוֹרִיר are said to be used by J of going to Egypt 37:25; 39:1; 43:11,15,20,22; 44:21,23,26, but הָבִיא by E 37:28; but יָרַר is so used in E 42:2,3 and בָּוא in J 42:5; cf. 43:1.

The divine names give no help to the critics in these chapters. אֱלֹהִים occurs once in E 42:18, but three times in J 42:28; 43:29; 44:16 and אֱלֹהֵי שְׂרַי once in a J context 43:14, R is in-

voked to relieve the difficulty in 42:28 and 43:14; while in 43:29; 44:16 the critical principle is abandoned, which traces the occurrence of אֱלֹהִים to the particular document in which it is found, and it is confessed that its employment is due to the distinctive usage of the word itself. אֱלֹהִים is used because Joseph is addressed, who is acting the part of an Egyptian governor. This of course accounts equally for 42:18, where Joseph is the speaker. In 42:28 the implied contrast is between divine and human agency, cf. 4:25. In 43:14 the special appeal is to God's omnipotence.

The attempt to establish a parallel narrative to ch. 42 for J and to chs. 43,44 for E rests on very slender grounds. Snatches of the former are suspected in 42:2a,4b,6,7,10,27sq.,38, and of the latter in 43:14,23b. 42:2a is alleged to be superfluous beside 1a, which it is not; 4b is given to J because of אָסֹן and קָרָא, though these are found as well in E; v. 6 because of שְׁלִיט which occurs nowhere else in the Hex., and notwithstanding the plain allusion to Joseph's dreams in the last clause; "he knew them but made himself strange to them" in v. 7 because of the repetition in v. 8, which, however, is for the sake of adding a contrasted thought, and the removal of this clause leaves the following words, "spake roughly unto them," unexplained, so that Dillmann finds it necessary to transpose them after 9a; v. 10 because of אָכַל, though this is equally found in E; vs. 27sq.,38 for reasons already sufficiently discussed; 43:14,23b are cut out of their connection and given to E, because they flatly contradict the critical allegation that J knows nothing of Simeon's imprisonment and that he never says El Shaddai.

2. Chapter 45.

This chapter is mainly assigned to E on the ground of alleged discrepancies with what precedes and follows. How, it is said, could Joseph ask, v. 3, whether his father was yet living after his own previous inquiry, 43:27,28, and Judah's speech, 44:18-34, as reported by J? The suggestion only shows how utterly this cold and captious criticism is out of sympathy with the writer and with the whole situation. Joseph's heart is bursting with long suppressed emotion. He had asked about the old man of whom they spake. He can maintain this distance

and reserve no longer. With the disclosure "I am Joseph," his first utterance follows the bent of his affections, "How is my father?"

Again it is objected that Pharaoh had bidden Joseph bring his father with his household to Egypt, promising him the good of the land, 45:17,18; yet, 47:1, Joseph announces their coming to Pharaoh, as though he had never heard of it before; they petition, v. 4, to be allowed to dwell in Goshen, and Pharaoh grants it, v. 6, without any allusion to his previous invitation and promise.

But there is no implication in this last act that the first had not preceded it. All proceeds quite naturally in the narrative. At the first intimation of the presence of Joseph's brethren Pharaoh asks them to Egypt to share the good of the land, assigning them no residence, and only offering subsistence in this time of scarcity. Upon their actual arrival Joseph notifies Pharaoh of the fact and presents his brethren to him with the request that they may dwell in Goshen as best suited to their occupation. And when this is granted he presents his aged father to the king. All is as consistent and natural as possible.

While the grounds of division are thus flimsy, there are various passages in the chapter which are clearly at variance with the hypothesis of the critics, since what they allege to be criteria of distinct documents whether in language or in the contents of the narrative are here inseparably blended. Their only resource here as elsewhere is to interpret these damaging clauses as insertions by R, which they accordingly cut out of their proper connection and assign to J as though they were scraps taken from a supposed parallel narrative of his.

'Verse 1a is given to J because of הַתְּאֵפֶק, only besides in Hex. 43:31 J, but 1b closely connected with it to E because of הַתּוֹרֵעַ only besides in O. T. Num. 12:6 E.

Verse 2 is declared superfluous in its connection beside v. 16. But it is not. The action progresses regularly. Joseph's weeping was heard by those outside, v. 2, but the occasion of it became known subsequently, v. 16.

Verse 4b, the sale of Joseph into Egypt is in the wrong document; of course excision is necessary.

Verse 5 is a singular medley; no two successive clauses can be assigned to the same document. The first clause וַתַּעֲצֹבֵן J as 6:6; 34:7; the second, וַיִּחַר בְּעֵינָיִם, only besides in O. T. 31:35 E; the third, sale of Joseph J; the fourth, אֱלֹהִים E.

Verse 7a repeats 5b, but אֱלֹהִים occurs in both, compelling the critics to give both to E and so confess that repetition is not proof

of a doublet, or else, as Kautzsch proposes, to change one יַחֲוֶה to אֱלֹהִים and throw the blame on R.

Verse 10, Joseph's naming Goshen as their place of abode is implied in 46:28 J, where Jacob goes directly thither. It is hence severed from its connection and given to J in whole or in part, while its minute enumeration of particulars is such as is elsewhere held to characterize P in distinction from both J and E.

Verse 13 is assigned to J because of הוֹרִיר as 39:1, and because it repeats v. 9; so v. 14 because of נָפַל עַל צוּאָרַי as 33:4; 46:29, while v. 15, a part of the same scene is given to E. Wellhausen by comparison with 33:4 tries to establish a diversity between J and E in the construction of נָשַׁק, a conclusion which Dillmann thinks "weak in its feet."

Verse 28 is the response to v. 27, but one verse has "Jacob" and must be assigned to E, while the other has "Israel" and is given to J.

It is apparent here as in many other cases that the assignment of verses and clauses is simply the enforcement *nolens volens* of an arbitrary determination of the critics. No one would dream of sundering these mutually unrelated scraps from the rest of the chapter, with which they are closely connected, but for the application of alleged criteria which the critics have devised in other places in framing their hypothesis. These are carried rigidly through at whatever disturbance of the connection or havoc of the sense, because to abandon them would be to give up the hypothesis. The very least that can be said is that this mincing work, to which the critics find themselves compelled to resort to so great an extent in Genesis and increasingly so in the books that follow, lends no support to the hypothesis, but is simply a dead weight upon it. The hypothesis is plainly not an outgrowth of this and similar chapters, but is obtruded upon them, and the only question is how much lumber of this sort it can carry without signally breaking down.

Elohim occurs four times in this chapter, vs. 5, 7, 8, 9, in the address of Joseph to his brothers. As he is no longer acting the part of an Egyptian, he might have spoken of Yahweh as consulting for the welfare of the chosen race. But Elohim is equally appropriate, since the prominent thought here and throughout the history of Joseph is that it is God not man who guided the course of events, v. 8; 50:20.

3. Chapter 46.

Verses 1-5 are assigned to E except 1a which is given to J because of "Israel" and "took his journey" יָסַע. This affords an opportunity for creating a discrepancy. Jacob starts in E, v. 5, from Beersheba, in J from some other place, presumably Hebron, 37:14, and takes Beersheba on his way. It scarcely need be stated that the discrepancy is purely the result of the critical partition, and has no existence in the text itself. In v. 2 "Elohim" and "visions of the night," E,* conflict with "Israel" a mark of J. The difficulty is adjusted by erasing the unwelcome name and tracing its insertion to R.

Verses 6, 7 are attributed to P for reasons already considered, VI, p. 191. P's last generally acknowledged statement† is, 37:1, that, in contrast to Esau's removal to Mt. Seir, 36:6-8, Jacob dwelt in the land of Canaan. And yet here follows without a word of explanation the removal of Jacob and his family to Egypt; and it comes out in subsequent incidental allusions that Joseph was already settled there and married into a priestly family, 46:20, 27, that he was high in favor with Pharaoh, and it was he who gave his father and his brethren a possession in the land of Egypt, 47:7, 11. But how all this came about P does not

* The repetition of the name and the answer יָנַח as Gen. 22:11; Ex. 3:4 is also claimed for E; but Gen. 22:11 can only be assigned to E by manipulating the text and expunging יָהוָה.

† Two isolated and unexplained statements of Joseph's age, when tending flocks, 37:2, and when standing before Pharaoh, 41:46, are given to P by some critics and denied to him by others.

inform us. The critics are greatly exercised to account for so egregious a gap as this. Kayser suggests that P was theoretical rather than historical; Nöldeke, that R omitted P's account because it was contradictory to E and J; others, because it agreed with theirs. And yet elsewhere R is careful to preserve even the smallest scraps of P, though they are quite superfluous beside the more extended narratives of E or J, e. g., 19:29, and if we may believe the critics he is not deterred by inconsistencies.

The list of Jacob's family, vs. 8-27, is a critical puzzle. It is in the style of other genealogies attributed to P, and has expressions claimed as his, viz., Paddan-aram, v. 15, "souls," vs. 15, 18, 22, 25-27, "came out of his loins," v. 26. And yet it has its doublets in P, Ex. 1:1-5; 6:14-25; Num. 26:5 sqq.; Israel, v. 8, is a mark of J; and, as Kayser affirms, it has too many allusions to J and E to admit of their being explained as interpolations. Thus, v. 12, "Er and Onan, etc.," refers to 38:9 J; v. 18, "Zilpah whom Laban gave to Leah," and v. 25, "Bilhah whom Laban gave unto Rachel" to 29:24, 29* E; vs. 20, 27, Joseph's marriage and sons to 41:50-52 E.†

But it is alleged, VI, p. 12, that "P's statistics seem inconsistent with the prophetic stories." This is based on the assumption, which even Wellhausen‡ repels, that every individual person named in the list was born before the migration into Egypt. Such an inference might indeed be drawn from 46:8, 26 strictly taken. But to press the letter of such general statements into contradiction with the particulars embraced under them is in violation of the evident meaning of the writer. So 46:15 rigorously interpreted would make Leah to have borne thirty-three children to Jacob in Paddan-aram, one of whom was Jacob himself. Zilpah, v. 18, and Bilhah, v. 25, bare their grandsons as well as their sons. Benjamin is included, 35:24, 26, among Jacob's sons born in Paddan-aram, though his birth near Ephrath is recorded but a few verses before. The numerical correspondences of the table, a total of seventy, the descendants of each maid precisely half those of her mistress (Leah 32, Zilpah 16, Rachel 14, Bilhah 7) suggest design and can scarcely be altogether accidental. And a comparison of Num. 26 leads to the belief that regard was had to the subsequent national organization in constructing this table and that its design was to include those descendants of Jacob from whom permanent families or tribal divisions sprang rather than those who chanced to have been born before the descent into Egypt. It need not surprise us, therefore, if we find a few names of those who were still in the loins of their fathers, Heb. 7:9, 10, at the time of the migration. It is no departure from the

* It is with the view of quietly evading this difficulty that Wellhausen and Dillmann absurdly sunder these verses from the rest of the chapter and give them to P.

† Also v. 15 Dinah to 30:21, if Kayser and Schrader are correct in referring ch. 34 entire to J.

‡ *Composition d. Hexateuchs*, p. 51: "This list once and again bursts through the historic bounds of Genesis." Critical consistency requires this admission from those who assign 37:2 and 41:46 to P, VI, p. 1, or this document will be in conflict with itself.

usages of Hebrew thought to conceive of unborn children as included in the persons of their parents, 46:4b.

This view of the design and character of the list relieves it of all difficulty that four sons are ascribed to Reuben v. 9, but only two 42:37; that, v. 12, Hezron and Hamul, grandsons of Judah, are included as substitutes for his two deceased sons; and that, v. 21, ten sons of Benjamin are named, though, 43:8; 44:22, etc., he is called נער;* nor does it matter that some of those who are here spoken of as sons of Benjamin were really his grandsons, Num. 26:40; 1 Chron. 8:3,4.

The divine names in this chapter are grouped together in the opening verses, vs. 1-3. "The God of his father Isaac," v. 1, and "the God of thy father," v. 3, together with the worship at Beersheba are in evident allusion to the altar built there by Isaac and the divine manifestation and promise there made, 26:23-25, though it is at variance with critical theories that E should thus refer back to J. Had God revealed himself, v. 3, as "Yahweh, the God of thy father," it would have seemed eminently appropriate. But "the God of Isaac" is a designation equivalent to Yahweh. And there are special reasons for using the term האל from its association with the name Israel here significantly employed, from its allusion to 35:11, where the promise was given on his return to Canaan, which is now emphatically repeated as he is about to leave it, and from the meaning of האל the *Mighty One* with its assurance, just then specially needed, of omnipotent protection and blessing, and a like assurance is involved in אלהים v. 2, the God of creation and of universal providence.

4. LANGUAGE OF P.†

OLD WORDS.

- (1) רכוש see VI., p. 117. (2) רכש VI., p. 117. (3) ארץ כנען VI., p. 117. (4) ואלה שמות Sect. 7, Lang. of P. (5) פרץ ארם Sect. 7, Lang. of P.

5. LANGUAGE OF J.‡

OLD WORDS.

- (1) שבר trade in grain, Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (2) קרא meet, befall, 42:38; 49:1 J; 42:4 (so Dill.); Ex. 1:10; 5:3 E; Lev. 10:19 (later additions to) P. קרה Gen. 24:12; 27:20; 44:29; Num. 11:23 J; Gen. 42:29; Ex. 3:18; Num. 23:38sq., 15sq. E; Num. 35:11 P. (3) נכר Hl. recognize, Sect. 10, Lang. of J. (4) שאול Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (5) לולא Gen. 43:10 J; לולי Gen. 31:42 E; Deut. 32:27 J, all in Hex. (6) פעם Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (7) אפוא Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (8) אולי Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (9) בתחלה V., p. 151, note. (10) קרר Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (11) נשא עינים Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (12) שים V., p. 154. (13) חלילה Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (14) עתה V., p. 155. (15) נא Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (16) חרה Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (17) עצב V., p. 155. (18) מקנה Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (19) עברך Sect. 6, Lang. of J.

NEW WORDS.

- (1) אסון 42:38; 44:29 J; 42:4 (so Dill.); Ex. 21:22,23 E.

* הקטן the *youngest*, 42:13,15, etc., denotes relative not absolute age, and has no reference to size. Rehoboam is called נער *young*, 2 Chron. 13:7, when he was upwards of forty years of age, 12:13. Though Benjamin was tenderly treated as the youngest of the family and Jacob's darling, it must not be inferred that he was still in his boyhood.

† The numbers are those of HEBRAICA, VI., p. 11.

‡ The numbers as VI., p. 14.

- (2) אָכַל see above under ch. 42-44.
 (3) מָלִיךְ see above under ch. 42-44 (on 42:27,28).
 (4) טָף 43:8; 47:12,24; 50:8 J; 45:19; 46:5; 50:21; Ex. 10:10,24; 12:37; 32:16,17,24,26 E; Num. 14:3,31; 16:27 JE; Gen. 34:29 R; Num. 31:9,17, 18 (later constituents of) P.
 (5) הַתְּמַחְמָה 19:16; 43:10; Ex. 12:39 J; all in Hex.
 (6) זְמֵרֶת 43:11 J; Ex. 15:2 E; all in Hex.
 (7) בִּי 43:20; 44:18; Ex. 4:10,13; Num. 12:11; Josh. 7:8 J; all in Hex.

RARE WORDS.

- (1) שְׁלִיט 42:6 J, all in Hex.; "besides only
 Aram. and in late books, but it may here be a

technical word traditionally preserved, since it agrees remarkably with *Salatis* or *Silitis*, the name of the first ruler of the Hyksos in Egypt," Dillmann.

- (2) קֶשֶׁת 42:7 J; 42:30 E; fem. plur. nowhere else.
 (3) אֶמְתַּחַת see under ch. 42-44 (on 42:27,28).
 (4) יָגוֹן 42:38; 44:31 J; all in Hex.
 (5) עָרַב 43:9; 44:32 J; all in Hex.
 (6) תְּמָה 43:33 J; all in Hex.
 (7) מִשְׁנָה 43:12 J; all in O. T.
 (8) מִטְמוֹן 43:23 J; all in Hex.
 (9) כֶּמֶר 43:30 J; all in Hex.
 (10) הַתְּאָפֶק 43:31; 45:1 J; all in Hex.
 (11) מִשְׁאָת 43:34 (three times) J; all in Hex.
 (12) עֵמֶס 44:13 J; all in Hex.

6. LANGUAGE OF E.*

OLD WORDS.

- (1) שָׁבַר *buy* grain, Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (2) חָלַם referred to E by rule. (3) עַל-כֵּן Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (4) יָלַד V., p. 164, Lang. of J. (5) אֱלֹהִים explained above. (6) שִׁים V., p. 154, Lang. of J. (7) אָנַחְי Sect. 5, Lang. of J.

NEW WORDS.

- (1) מִרְגַּל 42:9,11,14,16,30,31,34 E; Josh. 2:1; 6:22,23 JE; verb רָגַל Josh. 7:12 *bis* J.
 (2) מִשְׁמֵר 40:3,4,7; 41:10; 42:17,19 E; Lev. 24:12; Num. 15:34 P; all in Hex.
 (3) צָרָה see under ch. 42-44.
 (4) שָׁכַל 31:38; 42:36; 43:14; Ex. 23:26 E; Gen. 27:45 JE; Lev. 26:22; Deut. 32:25 J; all in Hex.
 (5) נִכְהַל 45:3; Ex. 15:15 E; all in Hex.
 (6) כֹּלְכַל 45:11; 47:12; 50:21 E; all in Hex.
 (7) חֹס 45:20 E; all in Hex. except Deut.

- (8) טֹבַח 45:18,20,23 E; 24:10; Ex. 33:19 J; all in Hex. except Deut.
 (9) רָגַז 45:24; Ex. 15:14 E; all in Hex. except once in Deut.

RARE WORDS.

- (1) בָּר 41:35,49; 42:3,25; 45:23 E; all in Hex.
 (2) בָּנִים 42:11,19,31,33,34 E; all in O. T.
 (3) כַּחַן 42:15,16 E; all in Hex.
 (4) חִי (in an oath) 42:15,16 E; all in Hex.
 (5) רַעְבוֹן 42:19,33 E; all in Hex.
 (6) אָבַל 42:21 E; 17:19 P; all in Hex.
 (7) צָרָה 35:3; 42:21 *bis* E; all in Hex. except Deut.
 (8) מְלִיץ 42:23 E; all in Hex.
 (9) צָרוּר 42:35 *bis* E; all in Hex.
 (10) מַחִיָּה 45:5 E; Lev. 13:10,24 P.
 (11) טַעַן 45:17 E; all in O. T.
 (12) חֲלָפוֹת 45:22 *bis* E; all in Hex.
 (13) פּוֹג 45:26 E; all in Hex.

SEC. 12. 47:1-50:26.

1. Chapter 47.

The critics here again try to produce two divergent accounts by their usual method of making the part stand for the whole, and arranging successive incidents against each other as though they were variant reports of the same transaction. Joseph first presents five of his brethren to Pharaoh, that they may state their occupation and have an appropriate residence assigned them. He then pre-

* The numbers as VI., p. 16.

sents his father *causa honoris* for a formal interview.* This is all natural enough. But the critics will have it that there was but one presentation, viz., of the brothers, vs. 2sqq. J, or of the father, vs. 7-11 P. Then the words "as Pharaoh had commanded," v. 11, with their evident allusion to vs. 5,6, make it necessary to sunder these verses;† vs. 5b,6a are given to P and vs. 2-5a,6b retained for J, whereupon it is urged as the result of this dissection that what J calls, v. 6b, "the land of Goshen" P calls, v. 11, the land of Rameses, though this latter expression occurs but once and is an equivalent designation drawn from the chief city of the district.

Moreover v. 12 must be assigned to E as the fulfilment of the promise, 45:11, though E had not recorded the arrival in Egypt. This deprives the contrasted passage, vs. 13-26, of its proper connection and the difficulty is to find out where it belongs. The criteria of J and E are so intermingled in it that Dillmann thinks it necessary to assume that it was written by J on the basis of a previous narrative by E, which may originally have stood immediately after 41:55, and that it has been worked over by R.‡ Wellhausen takes it to be part of a supposed narrative by J parallel to that of E in ch. 41.

Verse 27b must be assigned to P as it has his characteristic expressions, notwithstanding the fact that it is duplicated by Ex. 1:7 P in violation of the critical rule so urgently enforced elsewhere, and notwithstanding the fact that it must then be severed from 27a, with which it is closely connected, (since "Israel" and "land of Goshen" are marks of J), and attached to v. 11.

The mention of Jacob's age§ and the term of his residence in Egypt, v. 28, is plainly preparatory to vs. 29-31, his charge to Joseph respecting his burial; but as he subsequently gives a like charge to all his sons, 49:29-33, a doublet is once more assumed, and the former given to J, and the latter to P.

Thus a well arranged, well connected narrative is torn to shreds, set at variance with itself, and thrown into confusion for the most trivial and inconclusive reasons.

* The critics say, VI., p. 20, that Jacob as the head of the clan ought to have been presented first. They may settle that matter with the historian, or if they please with R. The sons were the active members of the family, and the reason given in the narrative itself for the order of procedure is sufficient, cf. 34:5,11,13.

† The proposal to substitute the LXX. for the Massoretic text of 47:5,6, VI., p. 19, would certainly not be made by an unbiassed critic. Dillmann's motive in it is obvious enough. The LXX. have here, as so frequently elsewhere, rearranged the text for reasons of their own, which in this instance are quite apparent. In order to bring Pharaoh's answer into more exact correspondence with the request of Joseph's brothers, 6b is made to follow immediately after v. 4, and then a clause is inserted to prepare the way for v. 5.

‡ 47:26 J manifestly alludes to E 41:34. This and many similar facts, e. g., 46:28 J linked to 46:5 E, are consistent with Dillmann's view that J was acquainted with E, but not with that of Wellhausen that they were entirely independent.

§ The inconsistencies charged, VI., p. 20, have already been answered, VI., p. 206.

2. Chapter 48.

This chapter fares no better. The continuous narrative of Jacob's blessing the sons of Joseph is parcelled into fragments. "After these things," v. 1, is a mark of E, but as the preceding record is not from E, it is hard to tell what is referred to. "Israel" is a sign of J; 2b must accordingly be cut out from the connection to which it belongs, and be tacked on to the previous chapter. El Shaddai and other critical marks require that vs. 3-7 should be given to P; it thus becomes a disconnected fragment severed from its appropriate introduction and from the rest of the scene, in which it has its proper place. The remainder of the chapter is sadly split up by the alternate recurrence of "Israel," a mark of J, and "Elohim," a mark of E;* and after all the aid of R has to be invoked to account for Israel in vs. 8, 11, 21, where the critics themselves shrink from adhering to their own test.

"The composite character of this chapter" is thus argued, VI, p. 25: "(1) 48:1 = 47:29"; but they belong to different occasions. "(2) v. 8 says Israel saw the children of Joseph, while 10a tells us, he could not see"; but if "Israel" is a mark of J, vs. 8, 10a and 11 belong to the same document, moreover while he saw Joseph's sons he could not tell who they were. "(3) vs. 15sq. break the story of the crossing of the hands"; they merely complete the statement of Jacob's action before proceeding to say how Joseph interrupted it. "(4) v. 20a = 19"; not so, v. 19 is an explanatory statement to Joseph, v. 20 the formal blessing pronounced upon his sons. The following "differences" are alleged: "(1) according to E, Jacob is *sick* in his last days; not so in J. (2) J alone has the story about Joseph's oath. (3) J alone has the anecdote about the crossing of hands. (4) According to E, Joseph only receives Jacob's blessing, no other of the children, as J gives in ch. 49. (5) Jacob's blindness is known only to J." This simply amounts to saying that if a narrative be divided into two or more parts, one part will not contain what is found in another part.

By the same species of legerdemain Wellhausen and Dillmann claim that 48:22 is at variance with 34:25, 26, and in the next breath confess that it agrees with vs. 27-29.

The following divine names occur in this chapter: El Shaddai, v. 3, with allusion to 35:11; Elohim, vs. 9, 11, 20 with reference to general providential blessings; האלהים "the God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God who fed me all my life long," is but a paraphrase of Yahweh; Elohim, v. 21, Jacob dies, but God will be with his descendants.

* Wellhausen, who here shows himself less heroically consistent than Dillmann, gives vs. 3-7 to P, but all the rest of the chapter to E, affirming that it shows everywhere the peculiarities of E and that Israel can no further be considered a mark of J.

3. Chapter 49.

49:1-27 is referred to J, not as composed by him, and consequently not on grounds of diction and style, but as a pre-existing writing incorporated in his work, which is inferred from previous allusions to what is here said of Reuben, v. 4, cf. 35:22, and of Simeon and Levi, vs. 5-7, cf. 34:30. It is especially urged that the latter conflicts with 48:22 E, where Jacob says to Joseph, "I have given thee one portion (שָׁכֶם) above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorite with my sword and with my bow." It is said that Jacob could not have spoken of the capture of Shechem by his sons, which he so severely reprobated, as though it were his own act. This difficulty has been long felt and there have been various attempts at explanation, e. g., that לקחת *took* was a prophetic preterite (Tuch), or that Shechem is not referred to, but some other district whose capture is not recorded (Kurtz), or that the allusion is to Jacob's purchase, 33:19, which he may subsequently have had to defend by force of arms. Kuenen supposes the same allusion, and proposes to read "not with my sword and with my bow." Josh. 24:32; John 4:5 and the word שָׁכֶם show that some transaction at Shechem is referred to. While Jacob deprecated and sharply censured the action of his sons, it nevertheless was the act of the clan of which he was the head; but the property so acquired he gives not to those who participated in the deed, but to Joseph as a mark of special favor, and an earnest of his future inheritance in the land of promise.

The critics try to fix the age of this blessing of Jacob on the assumption that it is a *vaticinium post eventum*. Tuch refers it to the time of Samuel when the tribe of Levi was in ill-repute; Ewald to that of Samson the famous judge from the tribe of Dan, Knobel to the reign of David, Wellhausen to the period of the schism and the rival kingdoms of Judah and Joseph. Dillmann seeks to make it all square with the time of the judges. But the fact is that it is impracticable to find any one period, when this blessing could have been composed with the view of setting forth the existing state of things. The sceptre in Judah found no adequate fulfilment until the reign of David; and from that time forth the consideration enjoyed by the tribe of Levi was such that it could not possibly have been spoken of in the terms here employed. So that Kuenen in despair of finding any one date for the entire blessing supposes it to be made up of brief sayings which circulated in the tribes to which they severally related. But the censures passed upon the first three evidently prepare the way for that of Judah. The prominence given to Judah and Joseph are clearly intentional, not accidental, and several of the blessings would be insignificant or unmeaning, if taken by themselves and disconnected from the rest.

The structure and contents of this blessing make it impossible to explain it as a *vaticinium post eventum*. What is said respecting Levi compels to the

assumption that it is pre-Mosaic. A dispersion resulting from their priestly rank could not after that be spoken of as a sentence for the misdeed of their ancestor. The whole blessing is only comprehensible as utterances of the dying patriarch, modified by personal reminiscences, by insight into the characters of his sons and by their very names, with its ejaculation of pious faith, v. 18; and as a forecast of the future which found its fulfilment at separate epochs and in unexpected ways, and which, while clear and sharp in a few strongly drawn outlines, is vague in others, and has no such exactness in minute details as suggests actual historical experience.

The mechanical rigor with which Dillmann adheres to the text furnished by the name "Jacob" appears from his sundering v. 1a from its connection and linking it with vs. 28b-33, which is given to P as the alleged doublet of 47:29-31, though this in reality describes a different scene. The emphatic iteration in vs. 29-32 as in the original account of the transaction referred to, ch. 23, shows the stress laid by the writer on this initial acquisition of a permanent possession in the land of Canaan.

The divine names **אל** and **שרי**, both suggestive of omnipotence, occur in v. 25; and **יהוה** in v. 18, where Jacob gives expression to his own pious trust.

4. Chapter 50.

We are told that there are two distinct and varying accounts of Jacob's interment, VI., p. 20, J's vs. 1-11, 14, conducted by Joseph with great pomp and an immense retinue, and P's vs. 12, 13, in which all his sons and no others take part. J's narrative is the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. He gives no account either of the death (49:33 P) or the burial. Joseph goes with a great company to bury his father: he comes back after burying his father; but of the actual burial nothing is said. The only account of that is in the verses that are cut out and assigned to P. Kautzsch finds a doublet in 10b and insists that there are three distinct places of interment representing as many variant narratives, the threshing-floor of Atad, Abel-mizraim, and the cave of Machpelah; only it so happens that this last is the only place at which any burial is spoken of. Joseph's report of his father's language, 50:5, does not precisely correspond with 47:30: but as both passages belong to J, no fresh argument for partition can arise, however it is to be explained.

Verses 15-26 are assigned to E on account of the repeated recurrence of Elohim, notwithstanding the two-fold statement of age, vs. 22, 26, such as is always elsewhere given to P, and two phrases which R is credited with having inserted from J, "spake to their heart," v. 21 as 34:3, and "the land which he swore to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," v. 24; in the passages assigned to E no promise is given of the land of Canaan to any one of the patriarchs. The proof of unity arising from these frequent cross-references from one document to

the other can only be evaded by using the critical knife and invoking the agency of R.

P records the death and the interment; J the embalming, the funeral procession and the return from the grave; E the subsequent apprehensions of Joseph's brothers and his generous treatment of them. And yet these extracts from separate works, as they are said to be, match as perfectly as though they had come from the same pen, and the continuity of the narrative is as accurately preserved.

The divine names are, v. 17, "the God of thy father," which sufficiently identifies the God whom they served, and Elohim, vs. 19,20,24,25, where the contrast is each time that of the human and the divine.

5. LANGUAGE OF P.*

(1) *ימי שני* 47:8,9,28, but once beside in Hex. *ייר* Hy. Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (9) *פרץ* Sect. 7, Lang. of P. (10) *האסף אל עם* Sect. 7, Lang. of P. (11) *גוע* Sect. 3, Lang. of P (6:17). (12) *מכפלה* Sect. 6, Lang. of P.

6. LANGUAGE OF J.

The words attributed to J with scarcely an exception occur also in E.

OLD WORDS.

(1) *עברין* Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also in E). (2) *נ* with pers. pron., Sect. 6, Lang. of E. (3) *נ* 24:25,44; 43:8; 44:16; 46:34; 47:3,19; 50:9; Deut. 32:25 J; Gen. 32:20; Ex. 12:31,32; 18:18; Num. 23:25 E; Num. 18:3 P. (4) *עתה* V., p. 155, repeatedly in J and E, also in P 48:5. (5) *נא* Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E and P). (6) *שם* V., p. 154 (also E and P). (7) *מקנה* Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E and P). (8) *כלכל* Sect. 11, Lang. of E. (9) *טף* Sect. 11, Lang. of J (also E and P). (10) *שכר* trade in grain, Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (11) *הבה* Sect. 4, Lang. of J (also E). (12) *נהל* Sect. 8, Lang. of J (also E). (13) *ארמה* V., p. 153 (also E and P). (14) *רק* Sect. 3, Lang. of J (also E). (15) *על-כן* Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E and P). (16) *הן* 15:3; 27:11; Ex. 5:5; 8:22; Num. 23:9 E; Ex. 6:12,30; Lev. 10:18,19; Num. 17:27 P; Num. 31:16 (latest constituents of) P. (17) *מצא חן* Sect. 3, Lang. of J (6:5-8). (18) *עשה חסד* Sect. 7, Lang. of J (also E). (19) *אנכי* Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E, once P). (20) *שית* Sect. 8, Lang. of J (also E, once P (Well.) Ex. 7:23). (21) *רע בעיני* Sect. 6, Lang. of E.

(22) *מאן* Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (23) *גדל* Sect. 4, Lang. of J (also E, once P Num. 6:5). (24) *קרא* happen Sect. 11, Lang. of J (also E and P). (25) *אז* also E and P Ex. 12:44,48; Num. 20:6; Josh. 22:31. (26) *ארור* also E and P Num. 5:18,19,22, 24 bis,27. (27) *קשה* also E and P. (28) *טרף* Sect. 10, Lang. of J (also E). (29) *רבץ* Sect. 2, Lang. of J (also E). (30) *דון* Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E). (31) *ארה* Sect. 6, Lang. of J (twice in Hex.). (32) *כרה* 26:25; 50:5 J; Ex. 21:33; Num. 21:18 E. (33) *אכל* 50:10,11 J; 27:41 JE; Deut. 34:8 P all in Hex. (34) *יהוה* explained above. (35) *שטם* 49:23 J (not composed by him); 27:41 JE; 50:15 E; all in Hex.

NEW WORDS.

(1) *נצנ* (or *יצנ*) 30:38; 33:15; 43:9; 47:2 J; Ex. 10:24 E; all in Hex. (2) *מטה* 47:31; Ex. 7:28 J; 48:2; 49:33 out of an E and P context and ascribed to J; all in Hex. (3) *גרן* 50:10,11 J; Num. 18:27,30 P; Num. 15:20 S (Dill.), Editor of Lev. 17-26 (Well.); all in Hex. except Deut. (4) *תמן* 48:17 J; Ex. 17:12 E; all in Hex.

* The numbers are those of VI., p. 19.

† Nos. 27-31 are based on Gen. 49, which was not composed by J and does not represent his diction.

RARE WORDS.

- (1) מַרְעָה 47:4 J; all in Hex.
 (2) אָפֶס 47:15,16 J; all in Hex.
 (3) כָּחַר to conceal 47:18; Josh. 7:19; all in Hex. in this sense.
 (4) גִּוִּיה 47:17 J; all in Hex.

- (5) הָא 47:23 J; all in Hex.
 (6) חֲנַט 50:2,3 J; 50:26 E; all in Hex.

**Ἀπαξ λεγόμενα.*

- (1) לָהֶה 47:13 J; all in Hex.
 (2) זָקָן 48:10 J; all in O. T.
 (3) שָׁכַל PI. 48:14 J; all in O. T.

7. LANGUAGE OF E.*

The words attributed to E with scarcely an exception occur also in J.

- (1) אֱלֹהִים explained above. (2) חֶבֶק Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (3) שָׁם V., p. 154 (Lang. of J.). (4) אֲנֹכִי Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (5) שָׁטַם Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (6) נָשָׂא forgive Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (7) נָא Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (8) חָשַׁב Sect. 10, Lang. of J. (9) כָּלְכַל Sect. 11, Lang. of E. (10) נָחַם Sect. 2, Lang. of J. (11) טָף Sect. 11, Lang. of J. (12) רָבַר על לב Sect. 9, Lang. of J.

NEW WORDS.

- (1) שְׁלֵשִׁים 50:23 E; Ex. 34:7 J; Ex. 20:5 JE; Num. 14:18 R; all in Hex. except Deut.

RARE WORDS.

- (1) פָּלַל PI. 48:11 E; all in Hex.
 (2) רָגַה (verb) 48:16 E; all in Hex.
 (3) גָּמַל (Q&I) 50:15,17 E; all in Hex.

CONCLUSION.

We have now completed the critical study of the Book of Genesis and may pause at this point, while we sum up in a few words the results of our investigation. The critics claim that the alternation of divine names in this book is best accounted for by the assumption that Genesis is compiled from different documents, each using its own particular term for God; and when the partition is effected on this basis, each is found to have all the marks of separate authorship, its own peculiar diction and style, its own plan and purpose, and a conception of the history and of religious truth peculiar to itself. How far does the reality correspond with the claim which they make?

The interchange of divine names can, as we have seen, be readily accounted for in every instance from the significance and general biblical usage of the names themselves, while it cannot be brought into harmony with the hypothesis of the critics. In repeated instances Yahweh occurs where by the hypothesis it ought not to be, as 15:1,2; 17:1; 20:18; ch. 22; 28:21, and if Dillmann is right in referring ch. 14 to E, in 14:22. Elohim and El Shaddai also occur in inconvenient places, 4:25; 7:9; 43:14, and require the separation of what is most closely united, as 33:5,11; ch. 48, etc., etc.

In spite of the utmost efforts and the most ingenious devices it is impracticable to make out the continuity of the documents. By dint of picking out available clauses here and there and sundering them from their proper connection a shift is made to carry J along through the flood, and P through the early history of Abraham, R's conduct in preserving these scraps being explained by his reluctance to omit even the most insignificant portion of his sources. But this has to

* The numbers are those of VI., p. 24.

be abandoned in the lives of Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, where the most enormous gaps confessedly occur in each of the so-called documents. And everywhere in fact it appears that one document implies or expressly alludes to what is stated only in another; so that Dillmann maintains that J made use of E, and Jülicher that P drew upon both J and E; and indeed an unbiased consideration of the facts shows that they are all so closely bound together by mutual references and implications as well as by conformity of plan and purpose, that they cannot by possibility have been independently conceived and written.

In the attempt to establish the separateness of the documents large use is made of what the critics are pleased to consider parallel narratives, but which are not such in fact. Gen. 2 is treated as though it were a second account of the creation, when it is really a sequel to Gen. 1 preliminary to the fall, Gen. 3. God's subjective purpose to send the flood, 6:7, is confounded with his declaration of that purpose to Noah, 6:13, his acceptance of Noah's sacrifice, 8:20-22, with his consequent covenant with Noah, 9:1 sqq., as though these were identical repetitions implying different narrators; and so in numberless instances. Successive parts of the same transaction, or different elements entering into its constitution (e. g., the human and the divine, 30:37 sqq.; 31:7 sqq., or different motives for Jacob's journey, 27:42 sqq., 46, or for the hatred of Joseph, 37:4,8) are converted into variant accounts of the same thing when in fact they are mutually consistent and supplementary. This has been carried by Wellhausen and Dillmann to the utmost extravagance by means of so-called doublets, every emphatic repetition or enlargement being so considered and held to be an indication of some imaginary parallel of which only these occasional snatches survive.

Parallels are further found in totally distinct events, which differ in the actors, times, localities and circumstances, but have some general and easily explained resemblance. The resemblances are first paraded in proof of identity, and then the differences as so many discrepancies in the several accounts. Discrepancies are further multiplied by isolating passages and needlessly interpreting them at variance with their connection, every evidence of consistency being arbitrarily thrown out of the text as a harmonizing addition. by R, e. g., 7:7-9; 13:1; 15:7; 16:8-10; 26:1,15; 35:9, etc., etc.

The most capricious and inconsistent conduct is attributed to R, such as is an impeachment of both his honesty and good sense. He is held responsible in fact for everything that is at variance with the requirements of the hypothesis. And on the supposition that such a person really existed and did the work ascribed to him, it is quite impossible to form any intelligent notion of his methods or his aims. We are told that in some places he carefully preserves minute fragments of his sources, though they are a superfluous repetition of what has already been more fully stated in the language of other documents, and yet elsewhere he freely omits large and essential portions of them. In some

places he preserves unchanged what is represented to be plainly antagonistic, while in other places he is careful to smooth away discrepancies, and to give a different turn to variant passages by transpositions or by insertions of his own. He sometimes keeps his documents quite distinct in language and form, at others he effaces their peculiarities or blends them inextricably together. All these offices must be assumed by turns in order to carry the hypothesis safely through; but whether such a bundle of contradictions was ever incarnate in any actually existing person, the only proof of his existence being that these contradictory things are alleged about him, every one may judge for himself.

The diversity of diction and of religious conception, which is claimed for the so-called documents is as fallacious as the other arguments urged in proof of their separate existence. Formidable lists of words and phrases are massed together as the peculium of this or the other document. And the first impression produced by marshalling so vast an array naturally is that this is a very significant circumstance indeed. But it only needs a patient examination of these details with the lexicon and concordance, and a careful scrutiny of their real bearing, to show that they are absolutely devoid of significance for the purpose for which they are adduced.

Words are not to be mechanically counted but intelligently estimated. They are signs of thought; and that the words vary with the thought to be expressed implies no diversity of writers. A writer does not forfeit his identity because he uses words in one place which he has no occasion to employ in another. A very large number of words occur in J and E which are not found in P, and a considerable number in P which are not in J and E; but the reason is obvious. It should be observed at the outset that the words credited by the critics to particular documents require not a little sifting. A thorough examination shows that many of them recur in other documents likewise, or are of very rare occurrence even in that document to which they are assigned, and consequently are either not peculiar to it or not characteristic of it. These are plainly of no moment from any point of view.

But besides this, all that is assigned to P in Genesis, ch. 1-11, apart from genealogies is the creation, 1:1-2:3, and what is regarded as his account of the deluge in chs. 6-9. The great proportion of the words here classed as peculiar to P occur in no other P section of Genesis; then why should it be accounted strange, if they are not found in any section of J? They belong to the description of grand and world-wide events affecting all orders of animated beings; and why should they be expected to recur in narratives of the every-day life of individual men? The terms for God's covenanting with Noah recur when he covenants with Abraham. Those that respect the sex and species of animals recur in the ritual prescriptions dealing with such subjects. But many more technical terms of the ritual are to be found in J, Gen. 1-11, e. g., נפש soul (=

person), קדם *east*, זהב *gold*, אבן שֹהם *onyx stone*, צלע *rib*, לחם *bread*, עפר *dust*, כתנת *coat*, עור *skin*, כרובים *cherubim*, מנחה *offering*, חלב *fat*, צאן *flock*, נשא פנים *lift up the face* (4:7), חטאת *sin*, פתח *door*, ארר *curse*, נשא עון *bear iniquity*, פני יהוה *face of Yahweh*, אהל *tent*, מקנה *cattle*, העלה *offer*, נחשת *brass*, ברזל *iron*, טהור *clean*, יונה *dove*, זית *olive*, מזבח *altar*, עולה *burnt offering*, ניחח ריח *sweet savour*, יין *wine*, ערוה *nakedness*. This list of words common to the J section of Gen. 1-11 and to the ritual law, and which are not found in the P portion of these chapters and for the most part in none of the sections assigned to P in Genesis, might be yet further increased. It shows, if critical arguments have any value, that the former has as much claim as the latter, or even a greater claim to be regarded as of one piece with the ritual law. The J sections of these chapters really offer more points of contact with the diction of the ritual law than the P sections do. And in respect to the genealogies, it has already been pointed out, V., p. 162, that ch. 5 is as closely bound to chs. 2-4, J, as to ch. 1, P.

In the rest of Genesis, chs. 12-50, two chapters are assigned to P, viz.: chs. 17 and 23, the former recording the institution of circumcision, in which the phrases of the ritual law are to be expected, the latter the purchase of the cave of Machpelah with legal precision and formality. The promises of ch. 17 and the transaction of ch. 23 are repeatedly referred to, and, as is natural, in language borrowed from these chapters. Apart from these chapters and passages based upon them, P is confined to genealogies or brief statements for the most part of the patriarchs' removals, or of their ages or death. The entire narrative portion is given to J, or divided between J and E. Of course the words and phrases appropriate to such matters as are assigned to P are found in P; and such as are appropriate to ordinary narratives are found in J and E. With such a distribution of the material it could not be otherwise. It requires no assumption of a diversity of writers to account for it. In one chapter only, ch. 34, the critics are compelled by the allusion to circumcision to allow P a share in the narrative, and the result is instructive. The diction of P is there indistinguishable from that of J, and the critics are utterly at sea as to the lines of demarcation. It has further been shown that the paragraphs recording the removals of the patriarchs are more closely linked to J than to P; that ch. 17, P, is indissolubly connected with the preceding and following chapters of J, of which it is an indispensable link, and that it owes all its alleged peculiarities to its position in this ascending series; and that the statements of the ages of the patriarchs cannot all be referred to P without doing the utmost violence to the connection. In fact the critics are in the habit of playing fast and loose with a criterion which at times is their sole or chief dependence, and at others is disregarded entirely. While they profess to trace documents in a great measure by the connection of their several parts, they in numerous instances sunder what is most intimately bound together

by necessary implications or express allusions, thus nullifying their own principal clue and invalidating their own conclusions.

The two forms of the divisive hypothesis in chs. 12-50 are tossed on the opposite horns of a dilemma. The supplementary critics, who recognize but one Elohist and accordingly regard E as a part of P, can establish no criteria, by which to distinguish it from J. The documentary critics, who find two Elohist by separating E from P, leave for the latter only incoherent and unrelated fragments torn from their proper connection, which are without reason assumed to have once constituted a distinct document.

Between J and E scarcely any discrimination is attempted in point of diction beyond יהוה of one and אלהים of the other. The "special characteristics," whether in thought or language, by which E is said to be distinguished from J are considered, V., p. 171, and shown not to be distinctive at all. The alleged theological differences between P and J are also considered, V., p. 182, and shown so far as they actually exist to be involved in the meaning and usage of the divine names. Do not the facts of the case accordingly compel to the conclusion that the divisive hypothesis has no rational basis whatever in the Book of Genesis?

It has been my object throughout this discussion, so far as it has now proceeded, to examine with candor and thoroughness all the arguments in favor of a critical division of Genesis. I feel, as I stated in my first paper, no antecedent repugnance to such a division, if it can be fairly proved and apart from the revolutionary and destructive consequences, which are ordinarily deduced from it. But so far as I can see, the case is not proven. In spite of all the critical clamor, and the scholarly names arrayed on the side of the divisive hypothesis, I see no good ground for abandoning the old traditional belief of the unity of Genesis. And if the divisive hypothesis cannot maintain itself on literary grounds in Genesis, it cannot do so anywhere. In the historical portions of the Pentateuch that follow and in the Book of Joshua the analysis proposed by the critics is far more complicated, and simply amounts to forcing through a hypothesis considered as already established. It very plainly gathers no strength as it proceeds.

In the legislative portion of the Pentateuch the question turns no longer upon literary criteria, but upon an entirely different principle: are the institutions and enactments of the Pentateuch the growth of ages or the product of one age and of a single mind? It is here that the battle of the Mosaic authorship must be fought. Meanwhile the investigations thus far conducted justify at least a negative conclusion. We have examined the so-called anachronisms of the Book of Genesis, and find nothing which militates against its being the work of Moses. It is plainly designed to be introductory to the law. And if that law was given by Moses, as has always been believed and as the Scriptures abundantly declare, then Genesis, too, was his work.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF GEOGRAPHY.

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, PH. D.,

Columbia College in the City of New York.

II. CANDELABRUM SANCTORUM AND LIBER RADIORUM OF GREGORIUS BAR 'EBHRĀYĀ.

In continuation of my contribution to No. 3 of the *Mittheilungen des Akademisch-Orientalistischen Vereins zu Berlin* (Berlin, 1890), I publish here two further short texts on geography by the same author. The first is taken from M'nārath Qudhšē¹, and is intended to accompany and to explain the chart I published in the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*, May, 1888, 16sqq.²

For the first text three MSS. were available :

B. Ms. Berlin, Sachau 81 ; fol. 37a.—of the year 1403.³

P. Ms. Paris, Syriaque 210 (Ancient Fonds 121) ; fol. 36a.—of the year 1404.⁴

C. Ms. Cambridge University Libr., Syriac 21 ; fol. 29a—in a good Jacobite hand, if I remember aright, of the XVIth century.⁵

Although this text, with the exception of the last section on *fountains and rivers*, runs parallel with §§ 3-6 of the text published in the *Mittheilungen*, it seems to be of sufficient interest to deserve publication by itself. One section on the river *Sambation*, I have omitted entirely, as it is found word for word in the following extract.

For the second text I have had also three MSS. at my disposal.

B. Ms. Berlin Sachau 85 ; fol. 14b.—probably of the XVIIth century.

P. Ms. Paris Syriaque 213 (Ancient Fonds 129) ; fol. 10a.⁶

O. Ms. Bodleian Or. 467 ; fol. 16b.—of the year 1576.⁷ This text covers, substantially, the same ground as the two preceding ones. We can see from this how it was that BE. was able to compile so many works.

I have printed the texts as I have found them in the MSS. It is impossible,

¹ Cf. HEBRAICA, III., p. 249.

² In the Cambridge MS. the map is much more distinct. A good many additional names can be made out. I only note (*Proceedings*, p. xvii., 22) that the line must read

سندباد ابن ماجه في جزيرة العرب في سنة ١٠٠٠

³ Cf. *A list of Plants* p. 3. Neither of the other two MSS. contain the list.

⁴ Zotenberg, *Catalogue*, p. 161.

⁵ Prof. W. Robertson Smith, chief librarian in 1889, was kind enough to allow me the use of this MS.

⁶ Zotenberg, *loc. cit.*, p. 164.

⁷ Payne-Smith, *Catalogue*, Col. 557.

in many cases, to prefer the reading of one MSS. to that of another. For that reason I have burdened the foot-notes with a full list of variants. Emendations, when necessary, have been put into the translation or have been especially mentioned in the notes.

The spelling of the proper names has caused some difficulty. When I have suspected a Greek original, I have given the name in Greek; where an Arabic, in Arabic. When the name is current in Syriac literature, I have given the usual English equivalent. In giving the Greek originals, I have scrupled to depart from what I have found in my dictionary; though, at times, the Syriac text seems to intimate a different reading, e. g.:

Τιβέρις—ܬܝܒܪܝܬ, though one MS. has ܬܝܒܝܬ with *a*.

Apamea—ܐܡܝܬܐ.

Μαρεώτις—ܡܪܝܬܐ.

Κάπκας—ܡܪܝܬܐ, where one MS., however, seems to have read ܡܪܝܬܐ.

Νύσης—ܢܝܫܐ. One MS. has ܢܝܫܐ which perhaps = ܢܝܫܐ (Νυς).

Στήλαι—ܫܬܐܝܬܐ in acc.

Ἀδρίας—ܐܕܪܝܐ ending in *os*. One MS. has *as*; but the *Adscensus Mentis* also has *os*.

Εὐβοία—ܐܘܒܝܐ.

Μαιώτις—ܡܝܐܝܬܐ.

The whole subject of the Syriac transcription of Greek needs a special investigation—for which Duval's *Bar Bahtul* gives ample material.

The notes I have made as few and as short as possible. The necessary information and verifications will be found in the foot-notes to the translation in the *Mittheilungen*. There, in the introduction, I have spoken of the authorities from whom BE. seems to have taken his information. I am able to add two more names here. The one is the celebrated Abū-Raiḥān Muḥammad Ben 'Aḥmad Albērūnī, the Herodotus of India. Compare, e. g., the extracts cited by Qazwīnī I., p. 104, 17, p. 147, with the account of the 'Ωκεανός as given by BE. and the corresponding parts in the *Mittheilungen*. Whether BE. knew of Bērūnī outside of the citations in Qazwīnī I am unable to say. The second source is Aristotle in his *Μετεωρολογικά*. In the last section of the first extract, on *fountains and rivers*, I have shown the dependence in a number of cases. By what means BE. became acquainted with this work, I am not now in a position to explain. The fact itself is interesting.

ON THE POSITION OF THEIR SEAS AND THEIR BAYS.

That all-encircling sea which is outside of the whole habitable world and surrounds the whole earth is called 'Ατλαντικός and 'Ωκεανός. Some call its western

side alone Ὠκεανός. Of this a narrow mouth opens in the western corner to the inside, that which is called the strait of Hercules. There, also, are the στῆλαι, i. e., the pillars of Hercules. This mouth, then, flowing towards the east, widens, forming that bay of the Ἀδρία Sea which is the *Sea of the Romans* and the *Sea of the Syrians*. From this bay a tongue goes and becomes narrowed. It passes along the wall of *Constantinople*, and is called the *Sea of Pontus*. Thus, to the south of the Ἀδρία Sea lie *Alexandria* and *Egypt*. To the north of it are *Constantinople* and *Ρώμη* and the whole land *Francia*. In it are celebrated islands which are fully known to us, as *Κύπρος*, *Σάμος*, *Χίος*, *Ρόδος*, and *Σικελία*. To the east of it are the lands of Syria and those of this our sea.

The Ὠκεανός Sea, which is outside of the Herculean pillars, its flowing going towards the south, passes by the lands of the western Arabs, and by that *Silver mountain* and (those) *Moon mountains*, from whose caves spring the waters of the river *Νεῖλος*, and by the lands of the *Abyssinians*, and by the lands of the *Nubians*, i. e., by the whole land of the Cushites. At the end of this land there stretches out from it a certain small bay towards the north, opposite Egypt, which is called the *Sea of Reeds*, as if it were the end and termination of the *great sea*.⁸ In it passed the children of Israel on foot and Pharaoh was drowned. On account of the multitude of mountains and rocks in this bay, ships are unable to ride in it—except, perhaps, at day along its banks. That great sea from which this bay proceeds is called the *Red Sea*. And this, flowing towards the east, passes along the lands of *Sh'ba* and *Saba*, and along that land which is simply called *the South*. There are trees and frankincense. At the end of this land the sea which is called *Red*, forms a large bay towards the north, that which is called *Persian Gulf*. On the western side of this gulf is a city which is called *Basra*, and the whole land of *Babel* and *Seleucia*, and *Ctesiphon*. On its northern side are all the lands of the Persians. On its eastern side are the lands of the Indians.

The all-encircling sea, also, which is outside of this bay, flowing towards the east, passes along the lands of the Indians. At their end it forms a bay to the north which is called the *Sea of the Indians*. To the west of this sea are the lands of the Indians; to the east are the lands of the Tibetans. After them come the lands of the Chinese. To the north of it are the lands of the Huns, i. e., Turks, who are the Mongolians, it being their primitive land from which they have gone forth. The all-encircling sea outside of this bay, going further to the east, passes the well-known islands of the Indians, called SRNDIB, and another which is called *Qamār*⁹ and the other islands and mountains, from which are brought and

⁸ Cf. Payne-Smith, col. 2577, where K. has the same derivation. The last Syriac word there is, of course, ܩܡܪܐ .

⁹ I cannot substantiate this pronunciation. Yāqūt, i., p. 21, 11, gives *Qumair*; Reinaud, *Relation des voyages*, etc., text, p. 94, Sprenger, *El-Mas'ūdī's Meadows of Gold*, p. 186, Dimišqī, *Cosmographie*, p. 19, 2, give *Qumār*. BE. can have reference only to Cape Comorin, Ptolemaeus,

exchanged these sharp and costly and aromatic spices, فلغل, النجوج, فرنفل, etc.; and also precious stones, ὀάκινθος, etc.¹⁰

And so, stretching from east to north, it passes the lands of the Tibetans and Chinese and the land of the Huns which we have mentioned, and the land of the Iberians and many lands which are waste, and mountains which are inaccessible. It passes, then, by a great and black mountain which is in the north, and along the plains of the Caspians and the land of the Alanes. There it forms a bay from north to south, that which is called WRNG¹¹ in the language of that place. So, stretching from the north towards the west, it passes along the lands of the Scythians and the cities of the Bulgarians, and all Francia and the land of Andalus of the Arabs, where in our days the Franks rule. It comes to an end near the pillars of Hercules, from where it had commenced. Thus, the whole inhabitable world becomes like unto an island within the all-encircling sea, which encompasses the earth as a crown does the head or a girdle the loins.

From this chart which we have drawn, one can look at the inhabited world as in a vision, it being divided into seven κλίματα. (One can also see) the position of every land and every sea inlet which is derived from that all-encircling sea. In the land of the Iberians there is one lake which exists of itself, and stands in no connection with the all-encircling sea—so that one commencing at some well-known place on its banks and going all around it, would be able to reach the place where he commenced¹² were it not for that great river, which is called ATL, which pours its waters into this lake. This lake, on account of its greatness and extent, is called in books and in common parlance a sea and not a lake. Ptolemaeus calls it Ὑγκανία Sea. In our days they call it خزر. To the west of this sea is the gate of Iron,¹³ and the plains of the Caspians and Sharwān and Taberistān; to the south Great Armenia; to the east the lands of the Iberians; to the north that great and desolate black mountain which is at the end of the earth,¹⁴ i. e. EN.

ON LAKES.

Lakes are those (seas) that do not unite with that great sea Ὠκεανός. They are many in the habitable world. But those which are known to us are as fol-

Geogr., vii., 1, § 9, Κομαρία ἄκρον καὶ πόλις. Qazwīnī i., p. 171, 9. Ethe, *Kosmographie*, p. 502. Masudi (Sprenger, *loc. cit.*) says expressly that it is not an island! The confounding of this name with that for Cambodja (Ibn Khordādhbeh, ed. de Goeje, p. 68, 13) is well-known. See Yule, *The Book of ser Marco Polo*, ii., p. 318.

¹⁰ Reinaud, *loc. cit.*, p. 78qq.

¹¹ Cf. PAOS, May, 1888, p. xviii, note 13. Dimišqī, p. ١٣٣, 18. Yāqūt, i., p. 20, 16. Peschel, *Geschichte der Erdkunde*, p. 106.

¹² Qazwīnī, i., p. ١٠٥, 7.

¹³ Pliny, vi., 2, § 11.

¹⁴ Warren, *Paradise Found*, 135sqq.

lows: the lake of *Apamaea*,¹⁵ and that of *Tiberias*,¹⁶ and that which is called *Μαρεώτις*(ς)¹⁷ near Alexandria, and that lake of *Genessareth*¹⁸ where—as they say—are no fish because its waters change three times a day. From it wells up pitch in the form of a bull without a head.¹⁹ Not by iron nor by stone can it be split or broken. It can only be soluted by stagnant waters and menstrual blood. And (there is) that lake in Armenia which is called *Arkistia*, i. e., *Argīsh* and other lakes which are in *Adhorbīgān* and in the lands of Persia, and countless others.¹⁹

ON FOUNTAINS AND RIVERS.

Above we have spoken of two kinds of vapors²⁰—one dry and cloud-like, the other volatile and moist. Each one of them is either above the earth or within it. That cloud-like one above the earth produces winds and moves the air. (The one) within the earth moves and shifts the earth and produces earthquakes according to its strength. That volatile one above the earth, i. e., in the air, causes rains and snowfalls, etc.; within it [i. e., the earth] it causes fountains to flow. Those vapors, however, which are within the earth, if they possess sufficient power to rend the earth and their fullness is great, produce rivers.²¹ But if their fullness is small, they produce fountains. If they are between the two, they form pools. In case they have not sufficient power to rend—if they flow, they are called rivulets; if they do not flow, wells. Most fountains flow from the north on account of the great mountains which are there.

¹⁵ Strabo, xvi., 2, § 10 (ed. Kramer, p. 289, 7.) The spelling of the name—with a *waw*—is very curious.

¹⁶ We have here the unusual form ending in *ιος* instead of *ίας*.

¹⁷ Strabo, xvii., 1, § 7.

¹⁸ There is evidently some mistake here, as BE. has just mentioned the Lake of Tiberias! In his *Adscensus Mentis*, he says the same of the Cherith (1 Kgs. xvii., 3, 5, cf. *Mittheilungen* des *Acad.-Oriental. Vereins*, No. 3, p. 36, I believe that is also the correct reading here. Cf. also Aristotle, *Meteorologica*, ii., 3, § 39. *ZDPV*, ii., p. 113sqq.

¹⁹ I have only now (September) had a chance to look into Guy le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*. On p. 65, I see that the Persian traveler, Nāsir-i-Khusran (1047) makes a similar remark. Le Strange (*ibid.*, p. 66) refers me to Josephus, B. J., iv., 8, § 4—a passage which I ought not to have overlooked when I wrote *Mittheilungen*, etc., p. 36, note 2. Evidently BE. has drawn on Josephus for his description of this lake. The passage reads: *τρίς γάρ ἐκάστης ἡμέρας τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ἀλλάσσαν, . . . τῆς μέντοι ἀσφαλτον κατὰ πολλὰ μέρη Βώλους μέλανας ἀναδέδωσιν, αἱ δὲ ἐπινέχονται τό τε χῆμα καὶ τὸ μέγεθος ταύροις ἀκεφάλους παραπλήσιαι . . . ἕως ἂν ἐμυτρίω γυναικῶν αἵματι καὶ οὖρῳ διαλύσωσιν αὐτὴν, οἷς μόνους εἴκει.* Cf. also Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xv., 1, pp. 732, 736.

²⁰ Arist. *Meteor.*, ii., 4, § 1. *Περὶ δὲ πνευμάτων λέγωμεν, λαβόντες ἀρχὴν τὴν εἰρημένην ἡμῖν ἤδη πρότερον. ἔστι γὰρ δύο εἶδη τῆς ἀναθυμιάσεως, ὥς φαμεν, ἡ μὲν ὑγρὰ, ἡ δὲ ξηρά.* Cf. *ibid.*, § 5. Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, p. 141, 13sqq. Sprenger, *El-Mas'ūdī's . . . Meadows of Gold*, p. 231. Qazwinī, i., p. 189.

²¹ Cf. Olympiodorus to Aristotle, *Meteor.*, i.; xii., § 11. *Κρηνῶν καὶ ποταμῶν τὸ ἀπὸ γῆς ἔχειν τὴν ἀρχὴν διάφορον διὰ τὸ πῶσον. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ποταμὸς ἀπὸ μεγάλης πηγῆς, ἡ δὲ κρήνη ἀπὸ μικρᾶς.* (*Meteor.*, ed. Ideler i., p. 252.)

Many are the fissures in the mountains. They are like the pores of a sponge.²² From every side waters flow from them downwards. And that rivers which are very great arise from great mountains²³ is seen from the fact that Ἀράξης²⁴ the great river comes down from Mount Παράσος which is in Asia.²⁵ From this mountain, also, comes the Ἰνδός, that one which is greater than all (other) rivers. The river Φάσις flows from Mount Καύκασος²⁶ and runs into the Πόντος. And that this mountain is higher than all the summer mountains of the east²⁷ is known from the fact that only during the middle third of the night is the sun invisible.²⁸ From Πυρρήνη, the mountain in the west, flow the Ταρτησσός and the Ἰστρος, the great rivers. From the mountains of the Scythians flow rivers which are very great. From among the Cushites commence the rivers Αἰγών and Νύσης.²⁹ From that silver mountain rise the rivers Χρεμέτης³⁰ and Νεῖλος. Pīshōn, as the Pentateuch testifies, is that river which waters the land of the Indians which is called Hawīlā. Gihōn, i. e., Nile, is the river that waters the land of the Cushites and Egypt and the west. It is also called "the Black." The Tigris, narrow and rushing, waters the land of Persia and the north; and the Euphrates waters the land of Babel and Maishān, i. e., Basra.

Ray. The whole inhabited world—as if it were an island—is encircled by the sea Ὠκεανός, that (sea) which commences at the Islands of the Blessed and at

²² Arist. *Meteor.*, i.; xiii., § 12. Οἱ γὰρ ὀρεῖνοὶ καὶ ὑψηλοὶ, τόποι οἷον σπόγγος πυκνὸς ἐπικρέμαμενος.

²³ Arist. *Meteor.*, i.; xiii., § 11. Καὶ πλεῖστοι καὶ μέγιστοι ποταμοὶ ῥέουσιν ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων ὄρων. *ibid.*, § 14. Οἱ μέγιστοι τῶν ποταμῶν ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων φαίνονται ῥέοντες ὄρων.

²⁴ Arist. *Meteor.*, i., xiii., § 16. Ἐκ μὲν οὖν τούτου ῥέουσιν ἄλλοι τε ποταμοὶ καὶ ὁ Βάκτρος καὶ ὁ Χοάσπης καὶ ὁ Ἀράξης.

²⁵ Arist., *Meteor.*, i.; xiii., § 15. Ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ πλεῖστοι μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Παρνασοῦ καλουμένων φαίνονται ῥέοντες ὄρους καὶ μέγιστοι ποταμοί, τοῦτο δ'ομολογεῖται πάντων εἶναι μέγιστον ὄρος τῶν πρὸς τὴν ἑω τὴν χειμαρινήν. Cf. Olympiodorus, *loc. cit.*, p. 243. Ptolemaeus, *Geogr.*, V., ch. xiii., §§ 3, 6, 9. On Parnassus-Paropamisus, see in addition to *Mittheil. des Acad. Orient. Vereins*, No. 3, p. 37, note 3, Ideler's note in vol. I., p. 452 of his ed. of the *Meteorologica*.

²⁶ Arist., *Meteor.*, i.; xiii., § 17. Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Καυκάσου ἄλλοι τε ῥέουσι πολλοὶ... καὶ ὁ Φάσις.

²⁷ I have translated literally. The expression "ἱταὶ madhneḥā qaitāyē" = τῶν (i. e., ὄρων) πρὸς τὴν ἑω τὴν θερυνήν. Cf. Arist., *Meteor.*, i.; xiii., § 17. Ὁ δὲ Καύκασος μέγιστον ὄρος τῶν πρὸς τὴν ἑω τὴν θερυνήν ἐστι καὶ πλήθει καὶ ὕψει. See also Olympiodorus *ad loc.* (*loc. cit.*, p. 248) and Alexander (*ibid.*, p. 253).

²⁸ Arist., *Meteor.*, i.; xiii., § 18. Σημεῖον δὲ τοῦ μὲν ὕψους ὅτι ὁράται καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν καλουμένων βαθέων καὶ εἰς τὴν λίμνην εἰσπλέοντων, ἐτι δ'ἡλιούται τῆς νυκτὸς αὐτοῦ τὰ ἄκρα μέχρι τοῦ τρίτου μέρους ἀπὸ τε τῆς ἑω καὶ πάλιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας.

²⁹ Cf. *Mittheilungen*, etc., p. 38, note 3.

³⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, note 4. The text must be corrected accordingly. I have corrected the Bēth, which the MSS. have into a Kāph. The same correction must be made *Mittheilungen*, etc., p. 36 and *ibid.*, note 6. Cf. Arist., *Meteor.*, i.; xiii., § 21. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τὴν Λιβύην... ὁ τε Χρεμέτης καλούμενος, ὃς εἰς τὴν ἑξω ῥεῖ θάλατταν, καὶ τοῦ Νεῖλου τὸ ῥεῖμα τὸ πρῶτον, ἐκ τοῦ Ἀργυροῦ καλουμένου ὄρους. Cf. also Ideler's note *ad loc.*, p. 465.

that (island) in the west which is called Γάδεια.³¹ It goes outside of the whole earth to the south and passes the *Moon mountains* from which springs the Nile. It encircles the *Abyssinians* and the *Nubians*, forming the *Sea of the Berbers*, whose length is 500 miles, and whose breadth is 100 miles. It goes further, forming the *Red Sea*—that which becomes narrow and reaches in length 400 miles; its greatest breadth, which is the *Sea of Reeds* where the Israelites crossed, being 200 miles. It goes further, encircling the wilderness of *Pārān*, forming the *Sea of the Elamites*, where the *Euphrates* and *Tigris* empty; the length of which (sea) is 1400 miles, its breadth 500. It goes further, encircling all *Persia* and *India*, forming the *Sea of the Indians*, the length of which is 1600 miles. In it are 1370 islands—one of which is called *Tirani*³² or *Sarandib*. It is very great, 1300 miles being its circumference. In it are high mountains and many rivers. From it are brought the red ὑάκινθος and scarlet color.³³ It goes further, encircling the east, forming the *Sea of the Chinese*. It goes further, encircling the north, passing along the desolate mountains of the *Huns* and the lands of the *Bulgarians* and *Scythians*, and *Alanes*, forming the *Sea γαλατικόν* in which are nineteen islands of Βρεττανία. It encircles *Francia* and joins again with the *Isles of the Blessed* and Γάδεια.

Ray. Here a narrow mouth [strait] opens which is seven miles in breadth where are the στήλας or pillars of Hercules. It enters and passes in the midst of the inhabited world, reaching towards the east a distance of 5000 miles in length and 800 in breadth, forming that sea of us western people which is called Ἀδρία, in the north of which is Ῥώμη and *Francia* and Βυζάντεια and all Εὐρώπη. And in its southern part which is called Σικελικόν³⁴ are *Abessynians*, *Nubians*, *Berbers*, and *Egypt*, and *Alexandria*, and all Λιβύη. And in its eastern part which is named *Sea of the Syrians*, is *Tyre* and *Sidon* and all *Asia*. In this are five large islands, the smallest of which is Κύπρος, the circumference of which is 200 miles; and Σαρδον(ία) 300; and Σικελία 500; and Κρήτη 300; and Κύρνος 350; and five small ones, Ῥόδος, Κυμανός(?)³⁵, Σάμος, Εὐβοία, Χίος, and 252³⁶ others which are not designated.

Ray. The sea Πόντος is in the land of the *Scythians*. Its length is 1300 miles up to Trebizond.³⁷ Its breadth is 300. From this a narrow tongue passes along

³¹ Pliny, iv., 36.

³² P. reads Tirnani!

³³ Cf. Lagarde, *Rudimenta Mythologiae Semiticae*, etc., p. 48. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, p. 27, 3. Gesenius, *De Bar Al*, i., p. 22sq. Sachs, *Beiträge zur Sprach- und Alterthumsforschung*, ii., p. 23. Fleischer in Levy's *Neu.-Heb. und Chald. Wörterb.*, p. 725—all of which Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, vi., p. 91, should have cited.

³⁴ I. e., τὸ Σικελικόν πέλαγος. This reading must be restored in the text.

³⁵ The reading is quite plain here. I can only suggest that we have here again a mistake—for Cos. See other readings for the same name *Mittheilungen*, etc., p. 33, note 3.

³⁶ In the *Adscensus Mentis* (text, p. 8 20) hower 250.

³⁷ Written *Trabizonta*; cf. the Arabic form Yākūt, i., p. 306.

the wall of Βυζάντιον,³⁸ and pours into the Ἀδρία sea. North of this is placed the Μαῖωτις, the sea of the *Caspians*, i. e., of the QNYA. Former men called it Ὑγκανία or of the *Iberians*. In our days it is called خزر Sea. From it a river-tongue empties into the Πόντος Sea, as the Πόντος Sea does into the Ἀδρία, and the Ἀδρία into the Ὠκεανός.

Ray. Lakes are called such as do not unite with the great sea, as the lake of *Apamaea*, *Tiberias*, and Μαρεώτις which is near *Alexandria*, and that one which is void of fish, *Genessareth*; and that one of ARKSTIA, i. e., ارجيش;³⁹ and that of خوارزم; and many others. The Μαῖωτις alone, on account of its size, is called a sea and not a lake.⁴⁰

Ray. *Pishōn* is that one which waters the land of the Indians which is called *Hawilā*. The *Gihōn* is the Νεῖλος, which waters the land of the *Cushites* and *Egypt* and is called *Shihōr* (black); and the *Tigris*, narrow and quick, watering *Persia* and the north. The *Euphrates* waters *Babel* and *Maishān*.

Ray. In *Spain* there is a river which flows only during six hours every day. And there is there a river which for six years⁴¹ is completely dry, and in the seventh sends down much water. There is there a river which does not carry down water, but dry sand, which comes down with much force and is impassible in a ship or on foot. On the Sabbath day its flowing is withheld.⁴²

³⁸ Yāqūt, i., 500, 2.

³⁹ Yāqūt, i., p., 513, 5.

⁴⁰ In the *Adscensus Mentis* he says this of the Πόντος; but see *Mittheilungen*, etc., p. 35, note 5

⁴¹ The text has Š^enīn; but we must read Š^eīn, hours. Cf. *Mittheilungen*, etc., p. 12, 19.

⁴² In addition to *Mittheilungen*, etc., p. 38, note 5, cf. Josephus, *B.J.*, vii., 5, § 1. Guy le Strange, *Palastine under the Moslems*, p. 57.

כְּזֹנִים³⁶ מִדְּמִינִים. מִכֵּלֶּה לִּנְסִיחַ לְחֵמֶל בְּעִלְיֹת נָחָא. אֲמַרְיָהּ בְּמִלָּה בְּעִלְיֹת³⁷
לְיִזְמֵהּ וְיִזְמֵהּ לְיִזְמֵהּ³⁸.

אֲחֵי. מִקְדָּמָה מִדְּמִינֵי חֵמֶל³⁹ וְלֹא מִכֵּלֶּה לְחֵמֶל זָחַל אִם מִכֵּלֶּה⁴⁰ וְיִזְמֵהּ⁴¹.
וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.
5 וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת⁴² אֲחֵי אֲחֵי. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.
חֵמֶל בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.

אֲחֵי חֵמֶל בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.
וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.
חֵמֶל בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.

10 אֲחֵי חֵמֶל בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.
אֲחֵי חֵמֶל בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.
וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.
חֵמֶל בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת. וְיִזְמֵהּ בְּעִלְיֹת.

³⁶P מִלָּה בְּעִלְיֹת

⁴⁰P וְיִזְמֵהּ

⁴³B וְיִזְמֵהּ

³⁷P בְּעִלְיֹת

⁴¹O+חֵמֶל

⁴⁴O וְיִזְמֵהּ

³⁸OP>

⁴²B וְיִזְמֵהּ

⁴⁶O חֵמֶל

³⁹OP מִלָּה

NOTES ON THE PUBLICATIONS CONTAINED IN VOL. II. OF EBERHARD SCHRADER'S KEILINSCHRIFTLICHE BIBLIOTHEK.—I. THE INSCRIPTIONS OF SENNACHERIB.*

BY REV. W. MUSS-ARNOLT, PH. D.,

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The notes in this number of *HEBRAICA*¹ will be confined to Dr. Bezold's transliteration and translation of the Sennacherib Inscriptions. I will, by no means, lay stress on minor points, such as, e. g., Col. I. 3, of the *Taylor-Cylinder* where *migir ilâni rabûti* should rather be read *miķir ilani rabuti* from *aķaru* to be precious (see Maspéro's *Recueil des travaux*, II. 82); there are many graver mistakes and blunders, which ought to be corrected. We will begin with the so-called *Taylor-Cylinder*, published in I R. 37-42.

COL. I.

5. epeš usâti, Bezold (following Hoerning's rather antiquated rendering) translates, (Sennacherib) *who restores order*, while in reality it means *he who renders support, help*, cf. LT., p. 142, rm. 2;² II R. 39, 44-5; ZA. IV. 11, 15, where

* Transliterated and translated by Dr. Carl Bezold (pp. 80-119).

¹ A review of the first eighty pages will be found in the *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society* for May, 1890.

² To save space I have employed the following abbreviations, which will also be used in the *Assyrian-English Lexicon*, on which we are at present engaged.

DH.= Delitzsch, *The Hebrew Language* (London, '83).

DK.= " *Die Sprache der Kossäer* (Leipzig, '84).

DY.= " *Wo lag das Paradies?* (Leipzig, '81).

DP.= " *Prolegomena* (Leipzig, '86).

DS.= " *Assyrische Studien*, I. (Leipzig, '74).

HN.=Haupt, *Das Babyl. Nimrod-Epos* (Leipzig, '84).

HT.= " *ASKT*.

LS.= Lyon, *Sargon-texte* (Leipzig, '83).

LT.= Lotz, *Tiglath-Pileser I.* (Leipzig, '80).

ZB.= Zimmern, *Babyl. Busspsalmen* (Leipzig, '85).

I R. etc.= *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, Vols. I.-V., prepared for publication by H. C. Rawlinson (London, 1861sq.). See my *Rawlinson Bibliography* in Johns Hopkins Univ. Circ., No. 72, (April, '89), p. 60sq. I R. 37, 40 = I Rawlinson, plate 37, line 40.

BAS.= Delitzsch's and Haupt's *Beiträge*, I, (Leipzig, '89).

Guy.§ = Guyard's *Notes de lexicographie assyrienne*.

KAT.²= *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (Eberhard Schrader. Giessen, '83).

KB. I. and KB. II.= I. and II. Volume of Eberhard Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*.

PSBA. and TSBA.= *Proceedings, or Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* (London).

ZA. and ZK.= *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (Vols. I.-V. 1886sq.) and *Keilschrift-forschung* (Vols. I. and II., 1884 and 1885).

ZDMG.= *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig).

Asrb.= Asurbanipal; Asrn.= Asurnacirpal; Esarh.= Esarhaddon; Nebuchadn.= Nebuchadnezzar (I R. 53sq.); Senn.= Sennacherib; Tigl. Pil.= Tiglath-Pileser (I R. 9-16).

ana epeš usât dumki is correctly rendered by *to give gracious help*; ib., p. 14, 18 illika usâtuka *he came to thy assistance*; the noun usâtu is derived from asû (Hebr. אָסַף) *to support, to help*; cf. u-su-u III R. 70, 74; whence asû *physician*, IV R. 32, 34; ZK. II. 4 and ZA. IV. 437; asîtu and isîtu *pillar, column, properly support, prop.*

5b stands in parallelism with 5a; Bezold reads alik tappût akî and translates *who walks at the side of the law* (fortunately adding a query). Hoerning read alik maḥar na-a-ki-i *who walks at the head of the sacrificers*; also see LT., p. 171; Ls., p. 68, below, corrected the text and read alik tap-pu-ut a-ki-i, translating it by *he who comes to help the weak*; Latrille, ZK. II. 341, approached another step nearer to the true reading, connecting a-ki-i with aḫû; while J. Oppert in ZA. II. 329 has alik tab-bu-ut akî *qui va les sentiers de ta rémunération*; cf. also *Proceedings of the Berlin Academy*, 1888, p. 756 (C. Bezold). The reading and translation aḫû (not akû!) *weak* is the most natural; but neither tappût nor tabbût nor dabbût is correct; the noun is by all Assyriologists derived from the Akkadian tab *two*, whence Assyrian tappu *companion, partner*.³ I believe that tappût (with ט) is the correct reading for our passage; tappût stands for taṭpût from a verb taṭapu = Hebr. טָפַף *to surround, to encircle for protection*,⁴ alik tappût akî is *he who goes to surround for protection the weak*; alik tappût occurs as syn. of nararu *to assist* and rêṣu *to help*, in II R. 39, 3-6.

6. saḥiru damkâti *who undertakes what brings luck to him* (Der Glück-verheissendes unternimmt, Bezold); but translate *a frequenter of sanctuaries, a regular church-goer*, from saḥaru *to turn to, to frequent*, cf. ZK. II. 302; damkâti plural of damiḫtu, are *sanctuaries*, properly *places of grace*, (ašrâti) damkâti.

8. Ad la'iṭ cf. I R. 7, No. 9b, ina multate'a inašepe'a nešu ezzu; Asrn. I. 19 mula'iṭ ekṣuti, translated by Lhotzky and Peiser *burning the proud, rebellious*, following Ls., p. 62 ad l. 22; also see I R. 27. 13a; lîṭu *hostage*.

9. mu-šab-ri-ku za-ma-a-ni, *who crushes the enemies* (Bezold), but mušabriku does not mean *crushing*,⁵ but *he who hurls his thunderbolts against his enemies*.⁶

12. elî gimir a-šib pa-rak-ki u-šar-ba-a (iṣu) kakkê'a *und hat grösser als aller (andern) Bewohner eines Throngemaches meine Waffen gemacht*. (Bez.); *translate over all the priest kings gave he me the victory*; parakku is of course to be derived from the Assyrian verb paraku *to set aside, to separate, to dedicate*, by no means borrowed from an Akkadian noun; we have thus in Assyrian the same as in Greek τέμενος from τέμνειν, Latin templum for tempuslum from the same root tem; parakku is the sanctissimum, ZA. II. 182-4; IV R. 61,

³ Ht. 66, 1sq.; V R. 37, 30 and 39, 61; 39, 36 we have tappatu followed by ġirritu, Hebr. צָרָה (Lagarde, *Götting. Gelehrt. Nachrichten*, '82, 393-408; II R. 33, 76 ed.).

⁴ Dh. 20, 2 cf. שָׁפַף Ex. XIII. 16; Deut. VI. 8 and XI. 18; Dp. 46; Nöldeke in ZDMG. 40, 723 line 6 and note 3.

⁵ *Crushing* would be mu-šap-ri-ku from פָּרַק, cf. pariḫtu *violence*, Esarh. II. 47; Del. in LT. 185; also see ZA. II. 354sq. where our passage is translated, *he who does violence to his enemies*.

⁶ ZA. II. 216sq.; also ZA. IV. 108, 25 where we read mu-uš-ta-ab-ri-ku za'a-ri-ia; ad zamanu *enemy* = nakru, cf. e.g., V R. 64, 37b; ZK. II. 250, 87 and IV R. 46, 14, b, where we have to read za-ma (not ba!)-nu limnu *a wicked enemy*.

42a; cf. ašar parakki II R. 28, 44a, and ašib parakki II R. 35, 51-2; V R. 35, 28; ZA. v. 59, 7.

15b and II 44 *er hat unter meine Fuesse unterworfen* are by no means specimens of classical German; it ought to be either *Assur hat meinen Fuessen unterworfen*, or *Assur hat unter meine Fuesse gemorfen*.

16. malke šibḡuti *stolze(?) Herrscher, proud(?) rulers* (Bezold). I do not think that there can be much doubt as to the meaning of šibḡu or rather šipḡu.⁷

17. dadmešunu izzibu is a Hāl sentence, a fact overlooked by the translator. Kima su-din-ni (iḡḡuru) ni-gi-iḡ-ḡi ediš ipparšu ašar la'-a-ri *like the Sudinni-birds they fled lonely into the clefts to an inaccessible place*; sudinnu is explained by Pinches in *PSBA.* 7, Feb. '82, p. 56 as *falcon*, see also *TSBA.* VII. 86; the proper translation of this passage is, *like a falcon, the bird (living) in the clefts they fled at once(!) to an inaccessible place*.

The etymology of nigiḡḡu has not yet been found; it evidently is derived from ḡaḡaḡu = kaḡaḡu to *cut off, to separate*; nigiḡḡe are the *clefts*;⁸ nigiḡḡu is a form like ni-ḡu-(šunu) *excrement* Senn. VI. 21, from a stem נאḡaḡû; nindanu II R. 7, 27-7 cf. *BAS.* I. 163, above; *ZDMG.* 43, 199; nangigu II R. 20, 31 d; nakrutu = ri-e-mu (רחם) V R. 21, 63ab, cf. ukarri *I was troubled*, from כרה, thus properly *trouble, sympathy for some one*, then *grace*; nargitu a *bowl*, II R. 29, 76d; V R. 28, 12. I will not mention našaddu, *favorite, beloved*, because it is explained as a Niph'al-formation, ZA. II. 111 and 116, rm. 1; *ZDMG.* 43, 200, No. 9; DP. 97; nor nanniru *enlightener* (Asrb., Smith 126, 78) and nannaru Asrb. v. 37-8 which Jensen *ZDMG.* 43, 499, No. 7, explains as standing for nanmiru and nanmaru with progressive assimilation; also *BAS.* I. 166, No. 7; *KB.* II. 252.

19. ad ina mahrie girre'a *in the first of my campaigns, not in my first campaign* (as Bez.) see ZA. II. 268 rm. 4.

22. I should really like to know where Bezold has found the phonetic reading ki-ras-su for karašu *encampment*; kiras is the ideogram for karašu.⁹

24. (iḡu) ḡu-um-bi really means *freight-wagons*, notwithstanding the query of Bezold, cf. ZB. 81-2; it stands for ḡubbu, Hebr. צב, see DH. 20, 12; Asrb. VI. 22 mentions (iḡu) ša ša-da-di (iḡu) ḡu-um-bi *KB.* II. 205) and x. 85 ina (iḡu) ḡu-um-bi (MEŠ) (*KB.* II. 233). The last ideogram in l. 24 is not to be read parê, but šuhḡupate or šuhḡupate = *mulae* (Sb. 44; II R. 4, 677, Arab. biḡal) from the Akkadian šuḡub, while parû = *mulus*; cf. P. Haupt in *Andover Rev.*, July, '84, p. 97.

⁷ Ht. 26, 541 ša-pa(l)-ḡu; šapḡu *proud, mighty*, occurs in Tiglath-Pileser I. 68 and 89, III. 88 and V. 35 as an equivalent of la magire; also see *ibid.*, II. 69 and VIII. 32; V R. 20, 14 cf. and 40 gh.; ina šipḡi occurs in Asrn. II. 106 (cf. *KB.* I. 88-9).

⁸ ZB. 54-5; Guy. §116; in Ht. 31, 711 = V R. 21, 11b it is preceded by hurru (from ḡararu, *to be narrow*; Senn. III. 75 ḡur-ri not ḡa-ri as Bezold reads), and followed by nigiḡḡu kaḡ-kari. The plural is either nigiḡḡāti, II R. 19, 49-50b; or nigiḡḡe; Ht. 92-3, II. 39-40 nigiḡḡi bīti, the ביתי בִּיתִי (Ps. CXXVIII. 3); ḡiḡḡu *clefts*, we find in Hn. 24, 9; II R. 45 (No. 2) 5, and cf. ZK. II. 6, rm. 1; Senn. IV. 54 mentions the city of Bit-ḡiḡḡi; Asrb. VIII. 88sq. we read: *the soldiers marched birit iḡe rabuti (through immense forests), ḡi-iḡ-ḡe (through clefts)*; Del. in ZK. II. 94sq. translated *through thorns(?)* and Jensen *KB.* II. 220-1 reads (kaḡû) iḡḡi *through iḡḡu read*.

⁹ Ht. 31, 711; Del. *Schrifttafel.* No. 81 and 173; Dk. 9, rm. 4; Guy. §96 (begin.); II R. 65, Col. I. 20; III R. 13, 11b; Senn. III. 71, v. 23 and 29.

29. Read ša-šu (Hebr. שש) instead of bušu and compare my notes in *Proc. Am. Or. Soc.*, May, '90; *BAS.* I. 12, rm. 2; 160, rm. 1 and 314 rm. 1; instead of makkuru (Bezold *treasures* (?) *BAS.* I. 12, rm. 2, etc., reads makkuḫu but makkuru also occurs; cf. *ibid* 160; makkuru is to be derived from מכר to *buy*, whence also dam-ka-ru or rather tam-ka-ru a *field-laborer*, a *slave*, properly *one that is bought*; the usual derivation from an Akkadian D A M - G A R does not hold good.—ad zinniṣāti libbi ekallišu see *PSBA.* (8 Nov., '81) p. 12; *KAT*² 300 and 304.

30. (ameluti) rab-kussî(?) amelu) man-za-az pa-ni the *chamberlains*(?) the *body servants*(?); so Bezold. *ZB.* 46, rm. 2, shows that we have to read (ameluti) mutire the *vassals*; cf. IV R. 44, 46 and 61a; 62, 50a, also mu-tir II R. 51, 31b; *ZK.* II. 321; the mu-tir pûti are mentioned in II R. 31, 66ab, *BAS.* I. 203, 9; see also Senn. III. 72 where Bezold (following Sayce) reads itti (ameluti) kur-bu-ti šepi'ia, while the true reading is itti (ameluti) mutir pûti šepe'ia properly: *with those who hinder the access to my feet* (i. e., to me). The manzaz pani are not different persons from the mutire, as Bezold thinks, but are the same; manzaz pani stands in apposition to mutire and means the *highest magnates*, properly *those holding the seat before me*, a collective expression like the Arabic Diwân. After the mutire are mentioned, according to Bezold, the (ameluti) LUL and the (zinniṣati) LUL, the *male and the female servants* (? *musicians* ?); our translator simply follows Hoerning; see also Col. III. 38-9. The ideograms have to be read nâre u narâti, the *young men and women*.¹⁰

31. The siḫirti ummanišu are *all his tradesmen, all the artisans*, not *all his troops*, which would be siḫirti ummanâtešu; notice also siḫirti gen. for constr. state (siḫrat).

32. muttabbilut ekalluš ušeçam'ma, and *I led away*(!) the *portable things of his palace* (Bezold); but that would be unutu muttabilti ekallatišu, as we have in *Asrb.* VI. 19; *Jensen KB.* II. 205 *Geraeth, das in seinen Palaesten gebraucht wurde*. How can we reconcile Bezold's translation with such passages as *Tigl. Pil. Col. I. 15* ilani rabûti mu-ut-ta-bi-lu-ut šamê u erçiti the *great gods, the guardians of heaven and earth* (*KB.* I. 16, 17); also IV R. 14 (No. 3) 8; *ZA.* I. 403; the line evidently means: *I led away the guardians of his palace*.

37. The Ur-bi are discussed by *DY.* 305; also see II R. 39, 48 gh.; *Asrb.* III. 65 and *KB.* II. 292.

47. Translate *all these* (previously mentioned) *Aramean tribes, rebellious ones, I conquered at once* (mithariš, not *in open battle*); mithariš is a syn. of iṣteniš, cf. *Rev. d'Assyriologie* II. 13, 14.

61. *Ten quarts of wine* (10 *Maass Wein*) is Bezold's translation of *X imeri* (içu) karani; but imeru is not a quart, but a חמר, properly *a donkey's load*; see *LT.* 149; *ZB.* 6, rm. 2; *ZA.* I. 89, 90; IV. 371 sqq.

Bezold, more than the other contributors, uses a great many unnecessary queries, which could easily have been avoided by a careful study of other

¹⁰ It would do the compiler of the convenient *Babylonisch-Assyrische Literatur* no harm to read *K.* 2051, registered on pp. 209 and 284 of his book; nor would it hurt the editor of *ZA.* to read *Evetts'* remarks in *ZA.* III. 328 or the notes in *ZA.* II. 418.

texts; thus *rîmaniš attagiš* (nagašu) l. 69 really means *I scaled like a wild bull*.¹¹

76. We read *I destroyed with fire* E-EDINA kul-ta-ri, mušabešunu; Bezold translates *their huts (and(?)) tents, their dwelling-places*; but explain: *I destroyed with fire the* E-EDINA (the Akkadian for the Assyrian) kultari, *their dwelling-places*; kultaru being but the Assyrian translation of the Akkadian E-EDINA (properly bît-ğiri); see also KB. II. 216 ad Asrb. VIII. 121 where Jensen has the correct rendering.—tiğalliš ušeme means *I made like, I reduced to flames*.

COL. II.

7. pân niriija utirma Bezold: *I turned my yoke*; Col. IV. 78, he simply gives, *I turned around*, also see IV. 2; translate, *I turned the face of my team*.

37. King *Elulæus* ana ru-uk-ki (rûki) kabal tamtim innabitma ma-ti-šu emid, *he fled far away into the sea and I took away his country*; but I R. 43, 13 shows that we must read šadda-šu emid and translate: *he fled to a distant place in the zone of the sea and there took up his abode*; it is equivalent to eḫuz markita (Senn. Sm. 67, 18); ad šadda: *where, whereabouts*, see HN. 9 Col. III. 3; 11, 1 etc., also IV R. 52; it a syn. of šiddu, cf. ZA. IV. 8, 41; 10, 49. The foot-note on p. 91 ad Col. II. 47 is not correct. Ša Minḫimmu begins a new sentence and has to be rendered, *as regards Menahem*, etc.

64 and III. 28 Bezold reads nadan bilti kit(?)ri-e belutiija emid-suma išât abšâni, *the giving of my tribute of the submission to my lordship I put upon him and he became subject to me(?)*; in Col. III. 28 mandattu kitrie belutiija is rendered *the tribute due to my lordship*; read kad-ri-e, a derivative noun of kadru, *present, gift*; and translate, *the giving of tribute, a present to my lordship, I fixed upon him and he now bears(!) my yoke*.

72. ana AN ġil-li esiršu, so Bezold, adding in a foot-note, that Haupt's emendation of AN-ġil-li to BAR-ĠILLI is thus done away with forever. Bezold is by no means the first to have noticed this; it has been corrected, among others, by Del. *Lesestuecke*³ XVI.; he makes, however, the additional mistake in considering AN an ideogram, while it is simply the constr. state of ânu enclosure, etc.¹²

77. ellamû'a si-id-ru šitkunu uša'lu (içu) kakkešunu, Bezold, *their battle array stood against me and they lifted up their weapons*. The correct rendering is: *they arranged their battle-array, appealing to their weapons*; cf. Col. V. 49, where Bezold—having P. Haupt's translation (*Andover Rev.*, '86) before him—translates the same phrase by *they let their weapons decide*.

I do not see why in a book like this library of cuneiform texts, published chiefly for the use of the "beginner and layman," bal-ṭu-su-un Col. II. 81

¹¹ rîmaniš a form like ḫuršaniš, abubaniš, Saṇtaniš from rîmu *wild bull*, Hebrew דָּנָךְ or better דָּנָךְ, so first Houghton in TSBA. v. ('77) 326sq.; DH. 6, 7; DP. 15-17 and 23; ZDMG. 40, 742, 6; it is a syn. of arḫu (properly the swift one), lû (the strong) and pâru, HT. 186; II R. 36, 10sq., nagašu ša alpi (to climb like a bull); = nagašu ša rîmi; s nagašu ša ameli; igguš = illik, *he went*, Del. *Lesestuecke*³, 142a.

¹² Compare an-bartum II R. 47, 15c; an duraru Khors. 137 = an dunanu V R. 50, 58b, etc.; also ZA. IV. 10, 38 and Bezold in Berl. Acad. Proc. ('88) 756 rm. 3.

(literally *in their condition of being alive*, for *balṭut-šun*) should not be translated at all, but rendered in Col. IV. 35.

COL. III.

6. Read *la ba-ne* (not *ba-bil*) *ḥi-ṭe-ti u kul-lul-ti*, *who had not committed sin and mischief*; *ba-ne* is the constr. state of the ptc. *banû*; the singular being used for the plural as is often the case in such construct connections. *ḥiṭṭu* and *ḥiṭetu*, by the way, in royal inscriptions, always mean *rebellion*, this being the sin *κατ' ἐξοχήν* against the king.

15. *ina šukbus aramme u kitrub šu-pi-i*. Bezold does not translate *arammu* and *šupû*: *arammu*, from *urim I built*, means *ramparts, walls*, thus we translate *by casting down, destroying the ramparts and by the attack of the šupû*, the latter being *a machine for besieging a city*; cf. *KB. II.*, pp. 13, l. 16, etc.

16. *ina mit-hu-ḡu zu-uk šepâ* (Bezold *the hostile onslaught of...?*) *u pilši niksi u kal-ban-na-ti*¹⁷) *almi, akšud*, etc. Bezold does not attempt to translate 16b. The line is very difficult. It says, *I surrounded so and so many cities ina mitḥuḡu zu-uk šepâ: with the attack (ZK. II. 281, 2) of my zuk šepâ*; III R. 9 (No. 2) 7 has *mit-ḥu-uḡ zu-u-ku šepâ*, see *KB. II. 26, 7*; Delitzsch's explanation of this expression as = *zūk šepâ: by the storm of their feet in Lesest.*³ XVI. is impossible. In the annals of Sargon, l. 49, we read of 300 (*amelu*) *zu-uk šepâ*; *ibid.* l. 124 we hear of the (*amelu*) *zu-uk šepaia li' my valiant zuk šepâ*. I believe with Winckler (*Sargon-texts*, p. 208) that it denotes a special kind of troops and consider *zuk* as the constr. state of *zukkû*, thè Perm. Piel of *zakû* to *be set apart, to be selected*; they were *the select, best foot-soldiers*. *zu-ki* in connection with *narkabtu* is mentioned in the synchronous history, II R. 65, 8 (*KB. I. 198*) *Nabukudur-uḡurma narkabtu u zu-ki ana i-di birti ša (mat) Aššur ana kašadi illika*; Winckler and Peiser translate it by "*Leicht bewaffnete*," *light-armed soldiers*. The same word occurs in *Asrn. III. 58, 60 and 63 (KB. I. 104-5)*, also in *S. A. Smith's texts III. 47, l. 6, amelu zu-ku ša ekalli*. Thus the (*amelu*) *zuk šepâ* were probably the same as the Latin *evocati*, and are equivalent to the *ḡâbe taḥazi'a gitmaluti* of *Senn. IV. 9*.

And now the king continues to describe how these warriors took the cities; above all (*ina*) *pil-ši*, *by breaches*, cutting through the walls which surrounded the cities;¹⁸ then *ina niksi by slaughter*, from the well known verb *nakasu* to *cut down, to slaughter*, *u ina kal-ban-na-ti* which seems to be a syn. of *kallabâti axes*, and a formation like *dalabanâti*, *Nebuchadn. III. 52*, from *dalabu*, syn. of *rapadu* and *šababu*, to *enclose, to surround*.

20. *The king Hezekiah I shut up in Jerusalem like an iḡḡuri ku-up-pi* (Bezold, *Kaefigvogel*), *like a caged bird*, he meant to say; this is the only passage

¹⁷ *Pilšu*, a breach, a fissure V R. 36, 24sq. from *palašû* to *break through*, Syr. *ܫܠܫܐ*, V R. 36, 23sq. It is a syn. of *šuplu*, *hole*, V R. 36, 25; II R. 29, 68 ab; *ZK. II. 175*, rm. 2; *Asrn. III. 53*—not II. 53 as Del. *Lesest.*³ XVI. has it—and III. 111; *Salm. Balawat*, Col. V. 1 *kima šelibi ina pilši uḡi like a fox in (his) hole he went off (KB. I. 136)*; Delitzsch and Peiser do not translate it; *Lyon, Manual*, p. 103, reads *bilšu* and says *some instrument or method of attack*; *apluš*, *I mutilated*, *Asrb. IX. 106*; cf. also *KB. II. 229* and *Senn. V. 68 (niše) pagrešunu upalliša clearing my way with difficulty through the corpses*, a passage left untranslated by Bezold.

in the historical inscriptions where the word occurs. It is the permansive of the Pŕēl of קור, with a passive meaning, like kuššudu (*KAT*.² 209, rm. 4), etc.¹⁴

21-3. The ḥalḡani, here, are not so much *the fortresses*, as the *approaches*.—ma aḡie abulli maḡazišu utirra ik-ki-pu-uš, Bezold renders this *and those who came out of the gates of his city, I made them return again*. I believe this to be an entirely wrong translation and render it thus: *and whosoever—(driven by hunger and famine)—came out of the gates of the city, I increased his sufferings, made him suffer still more*.¹⁵

31. Translate *the Urbi and his other faithful warriors*, instead of *the Urbi and his brave(?) warriors*.

33. iršû belâti *they surrendered their arms(?)*, so Bezold; translate *they allowed terror to take hold of them*; ad beltu *fright, terror*, see DP. 32, Hebr. בָּהַל, Aram. בָּהַל *to be confounded, frightened*.

35. The gu-uḥ-lu stone is mentioned in V R. 32, 27c and ZB. 45, DP. 132 have some notes on it.

36. The kussû nimedu is *a portable chair*, from עֶמֶד, so already Norris in his dictionary; according to ZA. III. 327 it is simply an epitheton ornans of kussû, see Senn. III. 76 and IV. 8 where kussû and kussû nimedu are used promiscuously. In our passage Bezold translates *a throne chair*; IV. 8 simply *a throne* and on p. 115 (I R. 7, No. VIII. 2) *an elevated, high throne*!

37. ušu or ešu *wood*; the editor of ZA. might have referred at least to ZA. III. 328 and IV. 108, rm. 3, etc.; while the urkarenu *wood*—left also untranslated by all the contributors to KB. I. and II.—is the Syr. אֲשֶׁקְרָא box wood (cf. irtanu for ištanu V R. 31, 40); Tigl. Pil. Col. VII 17; Ls. p. 84; *Americ. Journ. of Philology*, VIII. 279; Ball in *PSBA* ('89) 143-4; II R. 45, 47, etc.

47. There is no need to query *messenger* as translation of rakbu, if one knows II R. 39 (No. 5) 47 gh where ra-kab(!) occurs as a syn. of mâr šipri; also see Asrb. II. 100; ZA. III. 312, 58; Winckler, *Sargon-texte*, p. 226, s. v. rakbu.

48-49. kima aḡğari ediš ipparšidma ul innamir ašaršu, Bezold *he fled lonely like an... nobody saw whither*; but innamir is a Niph'al and the whole line is to be rendered *like a bird*—aḡğari a-byform of iḡğuri—he *fled at once, and his trace was seen no more*. This is followed by pân nirija utirma and translated by Bezold, *that fellow I had (now) subdued!!* while its meaning is the same as in Col. II. 7-8, IV. 78, etc., *I turned the face of my team, I returned*.

¹⁴ See Sb. 132 where we read SA-PA-RA (strangely alike *saparu net*) = ku-up iḡğuri *a bird cage*; also ZA. III. 132 (No. 5) l. 2 iḡu ku-up-pi and panât ku-up-pi.

¹⁵ u-tir-ra stands for ut-tir-ra cf. uttir Tigl. Pil. Col. VI. 35 and 104 (= Heb. הִתִּיר, Arab. وَتَرَ) *I increased*; ikkibuš (so and not ikkipuš!). Var.-šu, means *his suffering*; ikkibu stands for ik'ibu from כָּאֵב; const. state ikkib e. g., IV R. 10, 33, 46; Ht. 119, 6; is a syn. of maruštu; cf. also II R. 60, 13c ik-ki-bu-u-a(!) *my lamentation, my suffering*; ZA. IV. 240, 11 ikkib ilani; *KAT*.² 72; Zb. 67; ZA. III. 236 sq.; in ZA. II. 326, rm. 1. Pinches, following Jensen (*ZA* I. 12 sq.) derives it from the Akkadian EN-GIB; but Jensen, *ZDMG*. 43, 202, corrects his former statement and says ikkibu stands for nikkibu and this for mikkibu cf. Hebr. מִכְּאֵב; so also are formed, according to Jensen the nouns ikrebu, *prayer*; immeru, *lamb*; iptenu *meal*; and ipteru, *manumission*.

53. Translate *the war cry of my powerful soldiers*, and 55sq. render *he gathered the (statues of the) gods, ruling his country* (cf. DP. 195) *into their shrine* (i. e., šubtešunu Guy. § 38), *embarked them and fled like a bird to the city Nagitu in the swamps, at the border of the sea.* DY. 324.

60. Bezold omits to render u-tir-ma *I returned*, etc.

62. There can be no doubt as to the reading na-mur-ra-tum; it is a well known word, meaning *fury*; from namaru *to be furious, ferocious*, cf. Syr. ithnamer *to be furious*, nimru *panther*, etc. Guy. § 103, p. 95; ZA. II. 116, rm. 2; HEBRAICA, III. 227; namurratka ezziti ZA. IV. 8, 46; also see DP. 184;¹⁶ Col. III. 71-IV. 7 is a parenthesis, IV. 8 is closely connected with III. 70.

72. Read itti (ameluti) mutir pûti šepeia (II R. 31, 66b) na-aç-ku-ti; see PSBA. I. (April, '84), p. 151; ZK. II. 243; çâbe taḥazia la gamiluti are not *my undestructable army* but *my unrelenting warriors (who give no pardon)*; anaku kima rîmi eḳdi pa-nu-uš-šu-un aḡbat means *I, myself, like a strong wild ox took their lead*, i. e., *of the soldiers*, not *bot ich wie ein Wild ochse ihnen (den Feinden) die Stirn*.

75. Translate *clefts, ravines, dangerous torrents at the slope of the mountains I crossed in a chair* (aš-tam-diḥ for aštaddiḥ cf. Senn., Smith 104, 31 šunu ana Urukḥ uštamdihû); ad mi-li-é see KAT.² 565; Syr. melî'a *flood*.

78sq. ašar birkâ manaḥtu išâ çir aban šadi ušibma translate, *wherever my knees had a resting place*, i. e., *wherever I could walk*.

80. me sunâdi kaçuti ana çummia lu ašti, Bezold and others, *the water of the cold mountain springs I drank for my thirst*. I suppose it never occurred to them that such was no hardship, but rather a most refreshing drink in an eastern country; the passage really means *and even turpid, warm water I drank for my thirst*. I was satisfied even with such a miserable drinking water; cf. Jeremias, *Leben nach dem Tode*, p. 96, rm. 4; J. Halévy in ZA. II. 437 sq.

COL. IV.

9-10. Translate *my veterans accomplished under great difficulties* (šunuḥiṣ) *the entrance into the steep, narrow passes*; cf. Heb. בקעה valley, Syr. بَقْعَا, Arab. buḳ'atun from a root بَقَعَ *to split*, they were *passes full of seams and fissures*; ad l. 12, see II R. 32, 9; Ds. 73; Num. 23, 10.

30. multaḥtu, not translated by Bezold, is *a low rebel*; cf. I R. 27, 13a; see, however, Jensen ad Asrb. IV. 63 (KB. II. 191, rm.).

36. ina ešiti mâti Bezold—after Winckler—translates *through the occupation of the country*, but ešitu means *disorder, anarchy*. See DK. 5, 6; Guy. § 79. ZK. II. 83, Tiele translates, Šuzub, *who had taken advantage of the disorder and anarchy of the country to usurp the dominion of Sumir and Akkad*.¹⁷ Also HEBRAICA, II. 218.

¹⁶ An entirely different stem is namaru *to be clear, to be pure*, which may be an old Nîph'al formation of 'amaru.

¹⁷ ešû, whence ešitu, is usually connected with Arab. غشى *to cover*; but better connect it with the Hebr. עשה *to make, to do*; ešû = *to un-do, to disturb*.

39. šummanu, cf. also Col. V. 74, *fetters*, from šamû to *enclose*, according to Delitzsch; a form like ramânu—40. ad ša ida-šu isḥuru = kâta iḡbat = *he helped*, see ZB. 25.

42 (beg.). Read ellâti-šu (not elilâti(?)šu) *his forces*, from alalu to *be strong*, whence also allu, illu *strong*; usappiḥma properly *I spread*, *I scattered*, KAT.² 169, Ls. 62 and 59; uparrir puḥuršu does not mean *I destroyed him completely*, but *I broke down his army*.

48. (ameluti) ḡâbe šu-lu-ti-ia, not translated by Bezold, are *the warriors of my royal kingship*.¹⁸

52. Instead of Rib(?) te-su-la-ai read dannat-Sula'a, i. e., *Sula's fortress*; also see Col. V. 33.

56. (maḥazu) Di-in-tu ša Sula'a may be *the district of Sula'a*; cf. medinatun, properly *district*, from דין; 58. ad ak-ka-ba-ri-na; compare Hebr. עֶכְבֵר *mouse*.

59. naditu adi maḥazani ša niribi, etc., is *the settlement* (from nadû to *settle*, to *locate*) *together with the cities at the entrance towards*. 62. ad maḥazu ša naḡidâti compare Hebr. נָקֵר *shepherd*; and the alum ša tarbit (63) *is the city of the offsprings*.

ad 71. sitti maḥazani ana dannati ušerib, Bezold ought have remembered I R. 43, 40 sitti niše matišu ana dannati ušeli, cf. Senn., Smith, 112, 40.

75. Bezold's arḫu tam-hi-ri, left untranslated, should rather be arḫu tamteri (cf. mi-iṭ-ru *rain* = מֵטֶר); it is the month Tebet, the *rainy month*; cf. the parallel account in I R. 43, 42. In this month set in a ku-uḡ-ḡu dannu (var. ku-uḡ-ḡu dan-nu ikšuduma); Bezold and others render it *severe, cold weather*; *Proc. Am. Or. Soc.*, vol. XIII., p. xxxv, med. translates: *storm, tempest*. The best rendering is that of Jos. Halévy, *a great (unexpected) heat set in*; this weather brought about a heavy rainfall, šamutum ma-at-tum u-šaz-ni-na (*the heaven*) *poured down a mass of rain*; the parallel account in I R. 43, 43 reads ša-mu-tum la zi-iz-tum illikma (cf. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, I. 199 sq.; *ZA.* II. 434 sq.).

77. Read zunne ša zunne (var. mē ša zunnē) not zunnûti as Bezold has it, *rain upon rain poured down*; following this, Bezold and all Assyriologists, with the exception of DH. 15, rm. 2, read šalgu naḥli nadbak šaddî adura and translate: (*It poured down rain upon rain*) *and snow. I feared the torrents and mountain rivers*. But this is wrong. DH. 15 reads raggu (instead of šalgu) and I believe correctly; rag-gu na-aḥ-li belong together, as the parallel account proves, where we find rag-gu na-ḥal-lum; the raggu naḥli nadbak šaddê is *the fury of the torrents coming down from the (Elamitic) mountain-slopes*; cf. KB. I. 190, 10 mid-bak šad-u; BAS. I. 8, 15, rm. 13, and 175-6; *ZDMG.* 40, 733, 6 sqq.; Hebr. נֶרֶךְ.

80. ina ki-bit must be of course ina ḡi-bit, from ḡibitu *command*, and this derived from ḡebû to *speak, to command*.

¹⁸ šulutu from ša'alu to *decide, to rule*; cf. V R. 11, 11; HT. 108, 11; ZB. 99.

COL. V.

4. aḥi-šu dub-(?)bu-us-su cf. ZK. I. 319; ZA. I. 392. Jensen considers the Assyrian borrowed from the Akkadian, referring to II R. 29, 63 ab, where we read Dub-uš-sa = dubussû; cf. also ZA. IV. 111, 127-8. Read tuppus-su (for tuppuš-šu) literally *παχὺς* = pinguis, *weak-minded*; Talm. *ṭippêš*, ad Ps. CXIX. 9, 70.

5. Translate after *Shuzub* (the Babylonian, mentioned in Col. IV. 35) *had been carried off*.¹⁹

6. Instead of *mulluti limnuti* read *galle limnuti*, *evil devils*;²⁰ they closed their abullani; so Bezold, but read *abullate*, *abullu* being of feminine gender; see, e. g., ZA. II. 127, 20 *abullate-šu ša-ad-la-a-ti*.

7. *ik-bu-ut lib-ba-šu-nu ana epeš kamari(?)* so Bezold; but read *ik-pu-ud libbašunu ana epeš tukunti*, *their heart planned the making of an insurrection*; *ikpud* preterite to *kapadu*: Hebr. קָפַד, to *plan*, cf., e. g., KB. II. 180 ad Asrb. III. 37; IÇ LAL is not *kamaru*, as Bezold says, but *tukuntu*, *resistance, fight, insurrection*, see HT. 41, 154; Psalm CXXXIX. 21 where we have to read וּמִתְקוּמִים instead of "וּבִת", see Psalm XVII. 7.

8-9. Bezold: *šuzubu (amelu) Kal-da-ai ra(?) .(?) dun-na-mu-u ša la i-šu-u bir-ki la... (?) pa-an (amelu) piḥât (maḥazu) Laḥiri (amelu) a-ra... ku mun-nab-tu a-mir da-me ḥab-bi-lu ģi-ru-uš-šu ipḥuruma; they gathered around Shuzub, the Chaldean, a..., who had no tree of genealogy (Stammbaum), and who had fled before the governor of Lahiri, a blood... (?) a villain.*—The correct reading of these lines is *šuzub (amelu) kaldâ²¹ ḥab-lum²² dunnamû,²³ ša la iṣû birki²⁴ ardu dagil²⁵ pân (amelu) piḥat (maḥazu) Laḥiri a-ra-aḫ-ku,²⁶ mun-nabtu, amir dame²⁷ ḥab-bi-lu²⁸ ģiruššu ipḥuruma, around Shuzub, the Chaldean, the wicked, the base, who was a weakling, a vassal under the command of the governor of Lahiri, the fugitive, the deserter, the sanguinary villain they gathered.*

13. *anaku ni-tum alme-šu-ma napsatuš usiḫa*; some read *ḡal-tum, fight*, but the parallel passage Senn. Bav. 44 reads *ni-i-ti almema*

¹⁹ HEBRAICA, II. 218-20; Pinches in PSBA. 6 May, 1884. But see Del. Assy. Gram., p. 306.

²⁰ IV R. 2, 15 and 30; 7, 2; 29, 12; ZK. I. 295; ZA. II. 302, rm. 2.

²¹ Another person from the one mentioned in l. 5; cf. HEBRAICA, II. 218.

²² The traces point to ḥab-[lum].

²³ Compare II R. 28, 68c; ZA. IV. 23 bel. where it is compared to ulûlu, *the abject*; ZA. IV. 11, 20 *ana mu-ur-ri pi-i-šu dun-na-mu-u i-ša-as-si-ka, in the bitterness of his mouth the abject man speaks to thee*; it also occurs ZA. IV. 15, 16; cf. Arab. دَمَمَ to be vile, to be base.

²⁴ Bezold's translation is unquestionably wrong; P. Haupt in *Andover Rev.*, May, '86, translates *who was a coward, the cowardly bastard*, combining *dunnamû* and *ša la iṣû birki*; but *birku* must have been to the Assyrian the seat of physical strength; V R. 65, 34b, we read of strong oxen *ša la in-na-ḥu birka-šu-nu whose knees do not get tired*; also see IV R. 9, 38-9a; IV R. 1, 39 *ina birki ameli*; thus *ša la iṣû birki* means *who had no physical strength, was a weakling*; *tarbît birkia* is the *offspring, product of my strength*, Senn. Col. III. 64 and 78.

²⁵ After *birki* traces can be seen of the ideogram for *ardu (servant)* and *dagil (beholding)*, thus correct into *ardu dagil pân: the servant beholding the face of, i. e., the vassal.*

²⁶ *arākku* an intensive form; cf. Talmudic *arukka*, עָרַק to run away.

²⁷ *amir dame: blood-thirsty, properly full of blood*; *amir* = Hebr. מִרְיָר.

²⁸ See, e. g., Esarh. Cyl. A. II. 45.

(*KB.* II. 116 below); *I surrounded them with a hostile force*;²⁹ and *I threatened his life* (literally, *I made narrow*).³⁰ The three stem consonants of nitum are נוא.

14. lapân hat-ti u ni-ib-ri-ti innabit, *he fled on account of terror and need* (?); so Bezold; but read ni-ip-re-ti = nipretu from parû, Hebr. פָּרַע to cut off, Pîrêl uparri' Col. V. 77. See *ZB.* 93 and 104, rm. 1.³¹

15. Ki-i...ġi-ru-uš-šu ba-ši-i cannot mean *Da aber ihm dort zu wider waren*, i. e., *As...they disgusted him* (Bezold), but as they were behind him, followed him—ri-kil-ti is not *misfortune* but *vile infamy*, Hebr. רָכִיל; instead of hab-la-tu can also be read kil-la-tu.

16. Is correctly translated by Bezold, having Professor Haupt's translation before him, but unfortunately Haupt did not add a transliteration, and this accounts for Bezold's reading i-ti-u-ma instead of the correct i-ĥi-šam-ma, from ĥâšu, iĥîš, *he hastened* (as Hoerning already has it).³²

19. My corrected copy of I R. reads ip-tu(!)-ma they (i. e. the Babylonians) opened.

22. u-še-bi-lu-uš da'-tu, *they sent as a bribe* (queried by Bezold) is pretty certain; it is amusing to notice that only six lines below, the editor of *ZA.* translated the same word by *payment, wages*, without adding a query, evidently having, by this time, fully made up his mind about the meaning of da'tu. Jensen translates it by *gift, present* (*KB.* II. 186-7 ad *Asrb.* III. 13).³³

23. Bezold writes correctly di-ka-a *assemble*, from a verb דָּקַע, but Col. III. 43 he reads ad-ki with a כ instead of ק, see also Del. *Lesest.*³ 139 rm. 6. Jensen's remark on p. 206 of *KB.* II. is correct, if he reads diġû instead of dikû. There are two different verbs in Assyrian, dakû to overthrow, to crush, Hebr. דָּכָא, while to collect, to crumble, is daġû or better deġû (diġû) Hebr. דָּקַע cf. II R. 27, 17ab; *Asrb.* II. 129 and VIII. 71; Tigl. Pil., Col. V. 84, etc., *ZA.* II. 156, 17 id-ki-e.

30. e-šu-ra *he harnessed*, is perhaps connected with ma-ša-ru (*wheel*), see ad Col. V. 83, and compare the mašĥurim of Ezekiel. Del., *Assyr. Gram.*, §102, (p. 232) translates *he brought together*, from אָשַׁר to collect; also see *Lt.* 117, 12 ašušur = ašur = ešur; *ZB.* 39; *ZA.* II. 97, 16, whence eširtu temple and meširu members of the body, joints; *BAS.* I. 175.

38-9. Bezold reads sid(kid?)-ru ra-bu-u ik-ti-ra, *a great army(?) he collected*; Del. *Lesest.*³ 141, rm. 1, proposes ġihru or ġitru; but read kitru rabû iktera both, noun and verb, from the same כָּתַר which we met with in

²⁹ See V R. 19, 21 ed; Senn. Sm. 94 ni-ti-iš il-ma'a tenû'a and p. 133 an-ni'-ma (Col. V. 66).

³⁰ See *Asrb.* II. 54 (*KB.* II. 168) and cf. sâġu, properly straits; sîġu, sîġtu narrow; Hebr. הָצִיץ, צ for ס on account of ק.

³¹ Nipretu stands for mipretu, this for mipra'tu and that for mapra'tu; it is a syn. of pi-rit-tum (from the same verb parû), haštu and šuttu = want, oppression; e. g., V R. 28, 33ab, see also *KB.* II. 190 and 192 ad *Asrb.* IV. 43 and 93, where also Jensen reads wrongly nibretu, but translates correctly hunger.

³² See II R. 7, 10-11 gh.: 27, 10ab = ga-ra-ru to run; 29 Rev. 5-6 gh. = âru to go; Hebr. רוּץ or רוּץ in Pss. 71, 12 and 90, 10; see Guy. §76; *DH.* 62, 8; *HEBRAICA.* I, 179, 9; *ZDMG.* 40, 728, 4; also compare II R. 19, 45-46b, and IV R. 15, 59-61a.

³³ According to Delitzsch the three stem consonants are רָאָה; *ZA.* IV. 10, 42 we read maĥir da'ti *he who takes a bribe*; also cf. Winckler, *Sargontexte*, xxii. rm. 3 and xxxv. ad p. 104, 39, ki da'-tu-u-ti id-din-šu.

Col. II. 75.³⁴ Bezold's *sidru* was perhaps prompted by *sidirtu*, of l. 48 which is the Hebr. שִׁדְרָ, an incorrect writing for סִדְרָ. Cf. also *Khors.* 127, *ik te-ram-ma*; *Del. Assy. Gram.*, § 109 (p. 302) is wrong in connecting it with a verb קָרָא; Col. V. 48, see also *Del. Assy. Gram.*, p. 242, *rm.*

39. Occurs an unpleasant mistake, which is not even mentioned in the 'ad-denda et corrigenda'; Bezold reads *gibšušun ru-u-uh* (*matu*) Akkadi *iḡbatunimma*, instead of *u-ru-uh*, as I R. plainly has it.

42. *ad ana aḥamiš* see Pognon's *Bavian*, p. 8; and for *in-nin-du* from עִמְדָ, see IV R. 7. 54a; *Del. Lesest.*³ 95, 10; *ZK.* II. 390; *puḥuršunu in-nindu* does not mean *they united themselves into one force* (sie vereinigten sich zu einer Gesamtheit) but *their forces were arranged for a battle*.

43-4. *kima ti-bu-ut a-ri-bi ma'-di ša pa-an mât-ti mitharištebûni*, like a great swarm of locusts spreading over the country, they approached in a fighting mood (Bezold); but read *ša pân šatti*, at the beginning of the year, during spring-time (Haupt), and *mithariš* is = at once, a syn. of *išteniš*. See note to Col. I. 47; how will Bezold's translation suit the context of Col. VI. 12, where he does not know how to translate it? L.c. speaks of the horses whose riders had been killed in the battle, *ramanuššun ittanallaka mithariš utirra*, which means *they ran by themselves hither and thither and I brought them at once together* (to one place, so that they might not run away or do more harm).

45sq. *epir šepe-šunu kima zî kabtî* (cf. Col. II. 11, IV. 68 = *im-bare* IV R. 19, 16a; 3, 27; *Senn. Bavian* 44, *KB.* II. 116, below. *Del. Lesest.*, *Schrifttafel*, No. 251; *ZB.* 94, ll. 12-13) *ša dun-ni e-ri ia-a-ti pân šame rapšuti katim*, the dust of their feet was in front of me like a heavy storm-cloud, which covers the gray-colored (erz-farbene) space of the wide heavens; but *eri-ia-a-ti* is one word and l. 46 is to be rendered *which pregnant with mischief cover the face of the wide heavens*; *dunnu* = mischief; *eriâti* refers to *eprêti* (so read for *zî kab-ti*) and is fem. plur. of the participle *erû* heavy, pregnant; see Hosea XIV. 1 and Ps. VII. 15 עֲמַל עֲמַל.

55. *attalbiša si-ri-ia-am ḥu-li-ia-am simat ḡi-il-ti apira rašû'a* (Bezold), but read *attalbiša si-ri-ia AM (=rîmi) ḥu-li-ia AM (rîmi)*, etc., and translate *my cuirass, covered with the hide of a wild bull and my helmet covered with the same material*; *ḥu-li-ia* from *ḥalalu* 1) to excavate and 2) to be hollow.

60. (*iḡu*) *tartaḥu* is the javelin; *my fist* is *lak-tu-u-a* from *lakâtu*; cf. *Asrb.* II. 12 (*KB.* II. 166), etc.; *Del. Lesest.*³, p. 142; *ZA.* IV. 230, 10; *Del. Assy. Gram.*, § 80, e.

61. *nakire limnuti* stands in apposition to *gimir ummanâti*, a fact not recognized by Bezold.

62. Offers one of the worst transliterations and translations. The correct text and translation is *zar-biš u-mi-iš al-sa-a kima Rammân aš-gu-um oppressed I roared like a lion, like Rammân (the thunder-god) I raged*. Bezold has it *šarpiš ūmeš alsâ*, *I advanced (against them) shining like silver*

³⁴ Jensen (*KB.* II. 164 *rm.* ad *Asrb.* I. 127) reads correctly *kitru*; also see *Asrb.* III. 135 and *KB.* II. 195 *rm.* to *Asrb.* IV. 98.

and like the daylight. zarbiš ûmeš alsâ is one of the best known expressions in the Assyrian inscriptions and ought to be known to Bezold.³⁵

63. ana šid-di u pu-ti does not mean *on front and flank*, but *on flank and front*; this seems at first an unnecessary remark, but as the book is intended principally for the use of such who cannot control the transliterations and translations, this transposition of front and flank must be misleading; the same applies to l. 82 sapinat raggi u ġêni *crushing foe and friend* (Bezold, *friend and foe*), if indeed ġêni means friend, good; and Col. VI. 52, where the Assyrian should be šede lamassi instead of lamassani šedani; for šiddu from šadadu, see V R. 20, 46 h.

64. kima tib meġi šam-ri; the reading of šam is certain and needs no query; it has been settled long ago by Pognon in his *L'inscription de Bavian*, p. 75; Asrb. v. 95, we read agû šamru, *a wild flood* (KB. II. 200-1, and rm. 11); Tigl. Pil. Col. III. 57 where šam-riš occurs.

65. Read ina tukulti Ašur beli-ia.

66-7. Read suġ-ġur-ta-šunu aškun *I brought about their retreat, flight*; from saġaru to turn; not ġuġġurtašunu.

68. Read u-ša-ġir (not kir) *I made precious, scarce, I thinned their ranks*; Ht. 50, 9, Šaph'el of aġaru to be precious; see Haupt in ZK. II. 269.—gimri (ameluti) pagrešunu u-pal-li-ša uziziš; Bezold leaves this line untranslated. Render *through the mass of their (the enemies) corpses I cleared my way* (upalliša, see note ad Col. III. 16) *as if splitting it open*; uziziš must come from a verb azazu (according to J. Oppert = zâzu) corresponding to Hebr. חָצַץ, whence חֲצִיץ; others read tamziziš from mazazu.

71. tukultašu rabû stands in parallelism with ed-lum pitġudu and muma'ir ġâbešu, all three expressions referring to Humbanudaša and the suffix -šu to the king of Elam; adi (ameluti) rabutišu are his magnates.

72-3. Read ša paġar šib-bi ġuraġi šitkunu u ina har-re (Asrb. II. 11; KB. II. 166) aġ-pi instead of šimiri(?) as-pi, then continue ġuraġi ruk-ku-sa laġ-te-šu-nu, which means: *whose girdle-dagger was embossed with gold* (= Asrb. II. 12; KB. II. 166-7) *and whose wrists were clasped* (rukkusa) *with double* (ašpi עֲצָפָה) *bracelets of massive gold*. DP. 69 reads ġarre aspi ġuraġi; *Ringe, Machwerk aus Gold*, from חֶסֶף = יָצַר; cf. Hebr. חֶסֶף.³⁶

77. See also ZK. 282, rm. 3.

³⁵ zarbiš is derived from zarabu, cf. Sc. 307, Ht. 21, 399 and 43, 51 (zurub libbi); II R. 28, 60 e; 34, 61 ab, etc.; Dh. 60, 56; Zb. 6 and 70; Hebr. זָרַב Job vi. 17; Syr. and Arab. زَرَب; zarbiš is found Ht. 122, 13; Zb. 52; also Hn. 51, 5; 59, 2 ibakki zarbiš *oppressed he wept*.—ûmeš like a lion, like a beast, cf. Zb. 117 (ad 56 rm. 1); V R. 21, 40 it occurs as a syn. of nešu; the plural is ûme, e. g., IV R. 5, 1-2a ûme muttakputu, etc.; another plural is ûmâmu, which is generally considered a singular formation from מִמָּם (so Ls. and Del. *Lesest.* index); the ûmâm ġêri are the beasts of the field (Asrb. VIII. 109).—al-sa-a stands for aš-sa-a, preterite from šasû, a syn. of šagamu and ġababu to howl, II R. 29, 17-19d; Sc. 316; IV R. 17, 8b al-si-ka *I call to thee*; Hn. 58, 15 ilšû šamû the heavens roared; II R. 51, 17 ilani mala alsû the gods, as many as I call on (cf. ZK. II. 313); ad alsî for aš-sî, see E. P. Allen in *Proc. Am. Or. Soc.*, October, 1888, p. cxlii. and rm.

³⁶ See Col. VI. 3 and Asrb. II. 11sq.; ġarru bracelet from ġararu; aġpu double, we find in Ht. 91, 55; ZK. II. 39; Zb. 103; rukkusa, clasped, bound, is a permansive P'êl with passive meaning like kuššudu (iġġuru) caged bird, Col. VI. 19; Zb. 11.; ZA. v., pp. 4 and 5. Bezold's interrogation mark after kuššudu = caged in Col. VI. 19 is entirely unnecessary; Col. III. 20 we had iġġuru ġuppu; muġġuġu wounded and stamped, ZA. v. 15; nukkusû cut off, Asrb. iv. 74; KB. II. 192-3.

78. ša-mu-tum does not mean *heaven*, but *rain*, cf. Col. IV. 76; simani سم are *trophies*, see also Col. VI. 2; u mun-ni-šu-nu and *their arms, I scattered over the wide field*.

80-1. Bezold la-az-mu-ti mur-ni-iz-ki ĩ-mit-ti ru-ku-pi-ia ina da-me-šunu gabšuti i-sal-lu-u nari-iš; *covered with dirt(?) my horses, the team of my chariot, waded in their (i. e., the enemies) thick blood, like as in a river*; but translate with Haupt: *the spirited steeds of my chariot swam in the mass of their blood like a river god*.³⁷

82. sapinat rag-gi' u ĩ-ni Bezold *crushing good and bad*; but raggu is certainly *bad*, and ĩ-nu is usually translated *good*. I am, more and more, inclined to translate ĩ-nu by *bad, evil* and consider it a syn. of raggu, as Guyard and others suggested;³⁸ III R. 38, 18b; Nebukadn. II. 28, ragga u ĩ-ni ušessi (from עו) *the bad and the evil I threw down, I removed*; Tigl. Pil. I. 8 mušepu ĩ-ni *who crushes the wicked* (from عفر partic. Šāph'el) in parallelism with ĩalpat ābi.³⁹

83. ša....da-mu u rātu it-mu-ku ma-gar (ša?) ru-uš, *an der Deichsel(?) klebte Blut und Schmutz(?)* (Bezold); Bezold ought to have known that Prof. Haupt, in *HEBRAICA*, III. 110, corrected Hoerning and Sayce by reading ša....da-mu u par-šu ri-it-mu-ku ma-ša-ru-uš. But I do not agree with his translation, *my war chariot sank down to the nave in blood and filth*; narkabtu is a feminine noun, while ritmuku is a permansive Iteal of ramaku, like šitkunu (l. 72) and the whole is to be translated, *blood and filth ran (or dripped) down its wheel* (whenever the chariot was in motion); ad mašaru *wheel*, cf. Haupt, *Sumerische Familiengesetze*, p. 72; *BAS.* I. p. 174 and *HN.* 42, 11.

84. Read kima ur-ki-ti (not ur-ki-ti).

85. sa-ap-sa-pa-ti *testicles* (so Haupt after Pinches); Lhotzky, *Dissert.*, p. 23, suggested *ear-lap*.

COL. VI.

4. *With sharp swords hu-za-an-ni-šu-nu u-par-ri'*, Bezold (following Haupt's suggestion) translates, *their noses I cut off*.—Now line 6 speaks of *the rest of his (the enemy's) magnates*. May not huzanni-šunu be a byform to hazānu *governor* (cf. aĩĩaru a byform to iĩĩuru, etc.). This would give the following rendering: *with sharp swords I cut down their governor*, and now line 6: *the rest of his magnates with N. my hands captured alive on the battle-field*.

13. Adī II Kas-pu, etc., begins a new sentence, which does away with Bezold's somewhat obscure objection against Prof. Haupt's translation, *until the*

³⁷ Read lasmuti ptc. plur. of lasamu *to gallop*, Zb. 54, rm. 3, properly *to stretch out oneself*, syn. of rapadu, cf. *HN.* 44, 55 and 43, 20; II R. 27, 46-7; V R. 19, 18 cd, pariĩ ilasum *violently he rushes on*; also II R. 62, 15, 16 gh; IV R. 38-9a lasmu ša birkašu la innāhā; a study of ZK. II. 343 will teach the editor of that periodical that he has to write mur ni-is-ki a *splendid horse, a charger*, see LT. 146-7; Esarh. IV. 53, KB. II. 134-5.—isal-lu-u read išal-lu-u.

³⁸ See, e. g., Winckler, *Sargontexte*, index, s. v., ĩ-nu.

³⁹ I believe that ĩ-nu *cattle, sheep* and ĩ-nu *bad, evil* are simply homonyms; ĩ-nu *cattle* is the Hebr. אֵלֶּיךָ, Arab. ضأن; Aram.-Syr. ܢܝܝܝܐ; ܢܝܝܐ and modern Syr. uāna (cf. modern Arabic uakīl for 'akīl, etc., and Prof. Haupt, in *HEBRAICA*, I., 180, rm. 2), ܢܝܝܐ (ĩ-nu) is derived from ܢܝܝܐ (aĩ-ā) *to lead out*, just as πρόβατον is from προβαίνειν (Paul de Lagarde).

fourth hour of the night it went on (then finally) I stopped the slaughter. Accepting this rendering, we have, of course, to read adi II kasbu MI (=muši) illi-ku dakšunu apruḡ, and not adi II kasbu⁴⁰ mi-il-li-ku, etc., as Bezold does. Also cf. *BAS.* I. 4.

16. ḡar(?) ba-šu *vehemence* (Bezold); some, *ZB.* 20, rm. 1, read mur-ba-šu; cf. *Col.* III. 47; *V R.* 21, 41a; *IV R.* 1, 1a, a form like muš-pa-lu *depth*.—lû being a syn. of rîmu, pûru and arḡu, its meaning *bull* is quite certain.—18. u-da-i-šu דַּשׁ, cf. da'aštu; *HN.* 51, 10.

20. Read rather u-za-ra-pu; Bezold omits to translate kirib *the inside* (of their chariots); ad zarapu to *pour down*, etc., cf. Talmudic זָרַף, *Syr.* זָרַף; cf. *Ps.* LXXII. 6; ad VI. 9, see *Del. Assyr. Gram.*, p. 366; ad I. 19, *ib.*, p. 246; and I. 22, *ib.*, § 120.

Col. VI. 25 to the end, containing the description of Sennacherib's buildings, will be treated in connection with a special article on *I R.* 43, 44, a very difficult, but important, inscription, which Bezold omitted with the exception of seven lines (*I R.* 43, 13-19), see *KB.* II. 118, 119. Almost every line of *Col.* VI. 26-74, as transliterated and translated by Bezold, calls for corrections or additional remarks; suffice it to notice, in passing, that

26. ana šub(?)—bat šarrutia must be read ana ri-met šarrutia; constr. state of rimêtu *dwelling*, from ramû to *dwell*; see *Col.* II. 2 ušarmi *I settled*; *Senn.*, *Smith*, p. 144; the ekallu ḡabal maḡazi ša Ninua is *the palace adjoining the surrounding wall of Nineveh*;—27. ana tabrâti, cf. *Fleming*, *Nebuchadn.*, p. 40.—28. the reading kutallu is quite certain; it is the *Hebr.* כְּתֵל, *wall*, and means here a *side-building*, which for the keeping in order of the train, etc., my fathers had built; cf. *I R.* 44, 55 and *IV R.* 52, 20b ina kutallišunu muššurat; and 53, 18-19b ana kutalli it-ti-eḡ-su (from niḡesu to *recede*); *II R.* 48, 50 cd.

32. Bezold's reading la nu-ku-lat! is very good; but translate *his workmanship* (epištaš) *was not tasteful*.—labariš ûme = *in the course of time*.

35. kirubû ma'du is *a great deal of building material*, *Ls.* p. 65; u-šal-li read u-sal-li. A comparison with *Esarh. Cyl. A, Col. V. 6*, (*KB.* II. 134) shows that it is = ḡaḡḡaru.

36. Instead of a-kut-tim-ma read a-ḡaz-tim-ma; see *KB.* II. 135, rm. ad *Esarh. v. 6*; while *Winckler* (*KB.* II. 148: *Col. V. 10*) prefers again akut-timma, see his note on p. 148-9; cf. also *R. F. Harper*, *AEI.*, 14, l. 6.

42. (abnu) pi-i-lu; the pilu-stone ought to be well known to Bezold after *D. H. Mueller's* article on it (*Sitzungsber. der Wiener Academie*). *KB.* II. 136, 1 translates *Quader-steine*. Cf. *BAS.* I. 171 rm., and 325.

46. Read tim-kal-li-e, enḡuti ana(!) mu-šab; 48. the šadu ellu is *a snow-capped mountain*, not simply *a high mountain* (as Bezold has it).

55. ad ibili ass, cf. *Pinches in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, XIX. ('87), p. 319, also cf. *I Chron.* XXVII. 30 אוֹבִיל; also see *DP.* 124, rm. 2.

⁴⁰ Concerning kasbu, I notice that all the contributors to *KB.* I. and II. consider it an Assyrian noun, with the sole exception of *Jensen*, who believes it to be an ideogram: KAS (GAL) GID and says, *KB.* II. 202, rm. 5, "so wohl sumerische Aussprache = *Weg-lang*. Im Assyrischen ḡarrân-arku gesprochen(?); aber bei Leibe nicht kaspu!"

56. The attarati were not cars (so Bezold), but *bow-strings*, Hebr. יָתֵר, Arab. وَتَر and the erik-ki (!) are the *outfit*, cf. Hebr. עֶרֶךְ.

58. Read miṭ-pa-na-ti instead of ziz (mid?) pa-na-ti from ṭapanu to *stretch*, to *span*, Arab. ṭafana = ḥabasa to *bind*.

60. Instead of adannis(?) read ma-gal and compare Pognon, *Bavian*, p. 36; ZB. 28, rm. 1.

69. Read niḫi liḫ-ḫi *may he offer a sacrifice*.

KB. II. 114-5. *Belibus who had grown up in my palace kima mi-ra-a-ni ṣa-aḫ-ri like a small dog(?)*, so Bezold with a query; see II R. 6, 13ab sqq. LIK-KU = kalbu; LIK-KU TUR (*a small dog*) = mi-ra-nu; mirānu a form like ḡidānu, from the same stem as me-ir-ru, im-me-ru, mu-u-rum, ma-rum, whereof it is a synonym; also cf. Asrb. IV. 26 and Jensen's note thereto in KB. II. 189.

The arah si-bu-ti (KB. I. 114) is very likely *the seventh month*.

KB. II. 118-9 contains I R. 43, 13-19; line 14, end, Bezold leaves out ukîn; after ukîn a new clause begins, uṣalpit belonging to the following; ṣar-ri-šu e-mid ap-ša-a-ni does not mean *I compelled its king to do my will*, but *I put my yoke, fixed a yoke upon its king*; read ab-ša-a-ni and compare Hebr. אֲבִישׁ and Arab. أبس; also see Jensen's remark on page 173 of KB. II.

17. All their places I destroyed kima til abubi, Bezold *like a storm-flood-hill* (gleich einem Sturmfluthuegel); it is better to say, *like a mound of the time of the flood, I made them*.

18. Read a-nar (not a-lul) ina (iḡu) kakkê, *I overpowered with my weapons*; cf. the Bull-inscription, which reads a-na-ra; and I R. 49, Col. III. 4, âbe'a ta-na-ru (KB. II. 122).

ADDENDA.

Col. I. 5. Ad ṭaṭapu to *shut in, enclose*, see mu-ṭe-ṭip-pum (part. Pṛēl) and ṭi-ṭip-pu, *a door*, II. 23, 2, 3, c.; tappu *a companion*, is a Semitic word, as is shown by the byform ta ppiu; cf. Del. *Assyr. Gram.*, § 25, p. 62.

I. 16. Ad ṣapḡu see also HEBRAICA, II., 146, ad l. 13.

I. 30. Cf. K. 572, 10 man-za-az ekalli; ina pân ṣarri nazâzu = *to become a king's officer, body-servant*, K. 183, 34 = ina pân ṣarri erebu.

III. 37 urkarenu; for the interchange of r and ṣ compare also Uraštu and Urartu, אֲרָרְט; išdudu IV R. 15, 5 = irdudu (ib. l. 10); while the Assyrian duplicate in both cases has išdudu; maštakal = martakal = maltakal, IV R. 26 (No. 7) 37; markîtu and the Eth. mēskâi; BAS. I. 168, 13 and 182 rm.

HEBREW AND RABBINICAL WORDS IN PRESENT USE.

BY WILLIAM O. SPROULL,

University of Cincinnati.

We shall give a few of the most common Hebrew and Rabbinical words with some of their meanings in present colloquial use among the English-German speaking Jews.* The words are arranged alphabetically for the sake of convenience, but they readily fall into three classes: (1) Good Hebrew (biblical) or Rabbinical (Chaldaic and late Hebrew) words with their proper meanings. (2) Good Hebrew or Rabbinical words with new meanings. (3) Barbarisms. The following deviations in pronunciation as taught in the grammars must be noted. Qāmēç (קָמֵץ) when accented is pronounced as *o* in *rose*; when unaccented as *ë* or *ÿ*. The tendency is to give all long unaccented vowels the short *e* sound. דָּ and דֵּ are pronounced as *d*; ךּ as *v*; תּ as *s*, תֵּ as *t*. Whenever the colloquial meaning differs from the Hebrew or Rabbinical one, the latter is put into brackets.

אפיקורוס (Rab.). The Greek word Epicurus. It means one who does not care for religion. In the Rabbinical writings, it designates a man that has no regard either for the law or for tradition.

בהמה (Heb. *beast*). A stupid person.

בעל דרשון (Heb. בעל ruler, possessor. Rab. דרשון preacher). Preacher.

גוי (Heb. *nation*). It may mean any *individual* that is not a Jew, also a Jew that adopts Gentile customs.

גנב (Heb.). A thief.

דאגה (Heb. *anxiety*). Concern. "It is no דאגה (concern) of mine."

חברותא (Chald. *a company*). A crowd.

חדוש (Rab. *anything new*). News.

חזן (Rab. *the overseer of a synagogue*). The reader who leads in public worship, not necessarily a rabbi.

חכם (Heb.). A wise man, also ironically a pretender to wisdom.

חפה (Heb. *bridal bed*). The canopy under which the marriage ceremony is performed.

חמץ (Heb. *that which is leavened*). Anything to be eaten during the Pass-over. To this word, as well as to some others, the syllable דיק is added, mean-

* For words in use among German speaking Jews, see *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* von Dr. Zunz. Bëflin: 1832, pp. 438-442.

ing like **חֲמִץ-דִּין** of the nature of or like **חֲמִץ**. This **דִּין** is the German word Ding (thing). It is also written **דִּיג**, e. g., **חֲמִץ-דִּיג**.*

חַס וְשָׁלוֹם. A Rabbinical expression meaning *mercy and peace*, but more especially *God forbid*.

חַתָּן (Heb.). Bridegroom.

חַתֻּנָּה (Heb.). Wedding.

טָרֵף (Heb. **טָרַף** to rend). All food that is ritually unclean. This meaning is also found in later Rabbinical writings.

כְּבוֹד (Heb.). Honor or praise.

כֵּלָה (Heb.). Bride.*

כֶּשֶׁר (Heb. to be right). Food that is ritually clean. In Rabbinical writings the *Höph'al* means whatever is allowed. This word has become Anglicized, e. g., *Kosher* meat; the meat of animals killed and dressed according to the law. *Kosher* designates also a pious person, from Chald. **כֶּשֶׁר**, to be pious.

לִיחַ (Heb. tablet). Almanac.

מִוְהֵל (Chald. **מְוָהֵלָא**). The one who performs the rite of circumcision.

מָזַל (Rab. one's lucky star). Luck. Also **מִזְל-טוֹב**, good luck. The German word *schlimm* (bad) is also used, e. g., *Schlimm מָזַל*, bad luck. This word is at times used with **בְּרָכָה** blessing, e. g., "In this house there is neither **מָזַל** nor **בְּרָכָה**, neither luck nor blessing."

מַחֲוֵלָה (Rab. **מָחַל** to release a debtor from payment). Failure in business.

מִמְזֵר (Heb.). Bastard.

מִצִּיאָה (Rab. anything found). A bargain in purchasing.

מִצְוָה (Heb.). A biblical command. Colloquially, any noble act of kindness may be so called.

מִשְׁוֵמֵר (Chald. **יְשַׁמֵּר** to force one to apostatize; *Ithpaël*, to apostatize). Apostate.

מִשְׁפָּחָה (Heb.). A family.

נִפְקָא (Chald.). Prostitute. **נִפְקָ** (Chald.) means to go out.

סַנְדֵּק (Rab. **סַנְדִּיקוֹס**). Godfather. The one holding the child during circumcision.

עַם הָאֲרָץ (Rab.). One who is unlearned. The plural is formed by adding the termination to the last word, as if it were a compound word **עַם הָאֲרָצִים**.

פֶּסַח (Heb.). Passover. **פֶּסַח-דִּין** means anything that may be eaten during the Passover.

פְּרָם (Rab. one having control). President of a congregation. President of the Board of Trustees.

קָהָל and **קְהֵלָה** (Heb.). A congregation.

רִיחַ (Chald. **רִיחַ**, *Aphel*, to increase one's gain). Profit.

* Zunz, p. 439.

שַׁבָּת (Heb.). Sabbath.

שׂוֹמֵה (Rab.). A fool.

שְׁלוֹם עֲלֵיכֶם (Heb. *peace upon you*). Colloquially this means, *How do you do*, and may be used when but *one* person is addressed.

שָׂמִיט (Rab. *servant*). The janitor of a synagogue. The word is commonly pronounced Šames, not Šameš.

שָׂקִיזָה (Heb. שָׂקִיזָה *abomination*). A Gentile servant girl. שָׂקִיזָה is one who is not a Jew, or a Jew that adopts Gentile customs. There is an expression used very often, meaning *for spite*. It is pronounced as if written לְהַכְלִים. There is no such Hebrew or Rabbinical word כְּלִים. It may be a corruption of the Hebrew word כַּעַס *vexation*.

A very curious word is בִּיצְמֶר, meaning an *Irishman*. The word may be explained as follows. בִּיצָה (plural בִּיצִים) means *egg*, in German *Ei*. The word has been formed by suggestion of sound. *I*, the first syllable of the word *Irishman*, suggested the German word *Ei*, which suggested the Hebrew word meaning *Ei* or *egg*. The termination מֶר is the German *er*, affixed to names of countries to denote an inhabitant thereof.

NOTES ON THE ANALYSIS OF GEN. XV.

By BENJAMIN W. BACON,

Oswego, N. Y.

The analysis of Gen. xv. is universally recognized as an unsolved problem. At the same time all critics are agreed that P is nowhere present in the chapter, and nearly all recognize the *Hauptbericht* to be J and the supplementary material to be derived from E; some however suggesting, as a possibility at least, that the supplementation may be purely redactional.*

Kautzsch and Socin in their recent translation of Genesis may be taken as fairly representing current critical opinion in exhibiting verses 1-3 in the type used where J and E are indistinguishable, with a foot-note commending the analysis of Budde, J = 2a,3b, E = 1,3a,2b.

Budde's analysis appears to me entirely satisfactory, and I further agree with him, with Dillmann(?) and Kautzsch and Socin in attributing verses 4 and 6 to J and verse 5 to E.

The "רבר of verse 1 instead of simple אלהים as we should expect according to the analogy of xx. 3 is easily accounted for under the influence of the רבר " of verse 4. Indeed we should scarcely expect יהוה אליו in verse 4 if a יהוה אל-אברם originally preceded it already in verse 1. The inversion of 3a and 2b is not an unreasonable supposition in view of the equivalence of 2b and 3b. במחזה and אחר הר' verse 1, and אליעזר verse 2, are strong evidence for E, and verse 5 belongs of course with the representation במחזה. E is not traceable elsewhere in the chapter, and יהוה 2a,4,6, establishes a strong case for J in these verses.

The difficulty is with the position of the J fragment. The E material is properly enough placed but the J material in xv. 1-6 is almost certainly in a position other than that it originally occupied. If this be the case it is easy to account for the displacement, since R^{JE} having selected verse 1 from E to place at the head of the narrative would be compelled to adjust his J material to the position occupied by the parallel portions of E. But let us see first why xv. 2a, 3b, 4, 6, are to be considered out of place, and second, ascertain if possible the original position.

Dillmann, *Gen.*⁵, p. 242, objects to Budde's analysis that it ignores the incongruity of verses 6 and 8. For this reason, no doubt, Kautzsch and Socin

* For an exhibition of critical opinion, see the writer's article, *Pentateuchal Analysis*, *HEBRAICA*, IV., 4.

indicate the want of connection between verses 1-6 and the rest of the chapter by a blank space. In point of fact it is scarcely possible for verse 6 to stand so nearly before verse 8, and it is this matter of their position only—so we are informed in the foot-note 52 by Kautzsch and Socin—which induces these authors to print verses 7 and 8 in the type adopted for R. If, however, we can find a place for verse 6 *after* the passage 8-18 we not only avoid the difficulty but give double significance to both verses.

Again, xv. 7 can scarcely tolerate anything before itself in the narrative of the theophany. It is the introductory formula, cf. xvii. 1: xxviii. 13; xlvi. 3; Ex. iii. 6. On the other hand verse 6 creates a strong impression of forming a conclusion.

In the third place verses 7-18 must follow immediately upon xiii. 11ab, 12c, 13, 18 (verses 14-17 being an interpolation, see Wellhausen, *Comp. d. Hex.*, and Kuenen, *Hex.*), in order to obtain their real significance. Then both the solemn entailing of the land by Yahweh upon Abram forms the appropriate contrast to Lot's unblest appropriation of the Kikkar, and the important sacrifice of xv. 9sq. has its suitable *emplacement*, viz.: upon the altar of xiii. 18.

Finally, as Dillmann well says, *Gen.*⁵, p. 242, "Als Einleitung zu Cp. 16 ist die Zusage eines Leibeserben (also v. 4) bei C nicht wohl entbehrlich," and this "introduction" is certainly better placed immediately before the chapter introduced than separated from it by another episode. We conclude, therefore, that the true and original position, not only of verse 6, but of the whole passage xv. 2a, 3b, 4, 6 is at the end, and not at the beginning of the chapter. In other words it should occupy the place of the meaningless gloss, 19-21.

In this way the gift alluded to in verse 2 becomes a very pointed reference to verse 18, and the whole passage concerning the heir becomes of course vastly more significant after than before the covenant here described. One further adjustment may be at least suggested. As Wellhausen and others have observed, xi. 30 is awkwardly placed at present and would seem more appropriate nearer to xvi. 1. If so, its true position is perhaps to be sought, not in ch. xvi., but as a motive for xv. 2a, immediately preceding it.

J would, therefore, run as follows in ch. xiii.-xvi. xiii. 2, 5 (ולא יכלו) לשבת יחרו in verse 6(?) 7-10, 11ab, 12c, 13, 18, [וירא יהוה אל-אברם]; xv. 7 (perhaps originally in the form of xxiv. 7) 8-11 (part of verse 12(?), 17*, 18 (xi. 30(?)); xv. 2a, 3b, 4, 6; xvi. 1b (ולשרי instead of ולה), 2, 4-8, 11-14.

➤CONTRIBUTED NOTES.◀

Azazel (Lev. xvi. 8, 10, 26).—A careful review of the various opinions of expositors respecting this obscure term, which does even appear as a proper name in the versions of Luther and King James I., might not be without considerable interest for readers of this journal. But that is not my present purpose. Indeed, I should hardly have ventured upon such a subject, had I not, in the course of another investigation, quite unexpectedly lighted upon some facts which seem to have a material bearing upon the historical significance of this old world designation.

It is now, I believe, generally admitted that Azazel is the name of an evil spirit, anciently supposed to haunt the wilderness. So much, in truth, is clear from the context of the biblical narrative itself, interpreted without bias and according to the ordinary rules of Hebrew construction. And the evidence of later Jewish writings, such as the Book of Enoch, where we meet with Azazel again, as one of the spirits who fell from heaven, (not to mention what the Rabbis have handed down or invented upon the subject) proves that tradition never lost all sense of the original meaning of this weird figure of primitive theology.

It is a well-known statement of the Talmud, that the names of the months and of the angels "came up" with the restored exiles from Babylon into Judea. As regards the months, every student of Assyrio-Babylonian antiquity knows that the statement is true. As regards the angels, the case is not so clear, inasmuch as the biblical Michael and Gabriel, and the Rabinnical Uriel, Uzziel, Sammael, (identified by some with Azazel), and many others, have not been found hitherto in the cuneiform inscriptions. For Azazel, however, I may now offer evidence which connects both the name and the idea of the desert-fiend with the oldest religious beliefs of Babylonia.

The Chinese language possesses a complex character now pronounced hiai in the common dialect, but hai in those of Canton and Amoy, and yé in that of Shanghai; sounds which presuppose ki and gi as their primary forms.* This character is only used in composition with another pronounced chai or chi in the common dialect, but ti in that of Amoy, and za in that of Shanghai; sounds which imply as their precursors ti, di, za. Now the compound term consisting of these two characters, Hiai-chai, anciently pronounced Ki-di or Gi-di, is the name of a mysterious being who dwells in the desert, and goes wicked men when it sees them. The creature, which is described as a one-horned monster, like a stag, but is also depicted like a tiger, has another name of importance for our purpose, Shin-yang, the "Spirit-goat." Provincial judges and censors once wore a representation of it as their insignia.

The name and the habitat and the function of this "Spirit-goat," who dwells in the desert, and destroys the wicked, curiously corresponds with the name and the habitat and the implied function of Azazel. But I should have hesitated to

* See my papers entitled *The New Accadian in the Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, especially that in the June number of the present year.

bring the two fiends into direct relation with each other, had I not previously ascertained the identity of the Chinese Avenger of Wrong with an evil spirit of the desert, whose name frequently occurs in the primitive hymns and exorcisms of Accad. As we have seen, the oldest pronunciation of the Chinese demon was Kidi or Gidi; and, as all Assyriologists well know, the Gidim was an evil spirit, whereof the early inhabitants of Babylonia stood in religious awe. The resemblance of the two names is striking enough, considering the enormous geographical interval that divides the Middle Kingdom from the land of the Euphrates and Tigris. But there is a further coincidence in the case, which may fairly be called startling, and which demonstrates the validity of our identification of the Gidi of China with the Gidim of Babylon. It is the fact that the Chinese character pronounced hiai (= gi) is compounded of the simple characters for "dog," "horn," "knife," and "ox;" and the Accadian character pronounced gidim is composed of four characters which also have these selfsame values.* Thus the Chinese demon agrees with the Accadian in name, ideographic representation, habitat, and nature.

But what of the Hebrew Azazel? No self-evident or satisfactory etymology of this name is forthcoming, so long as it is regarded as a purely Hebrew term. The initial syllable, indeed, affords a sort of assonance with the word for "she-goat" ('ēz); but this hardly accounts for the termination. On the other hand, the first consonant of Azazel may very well have been strong Ain (Ghain); in which case the true pronunciation would be made like Gazazel. With this we may compare a dialectic pronunciation of the Chinese Gidi, viz., the Shang-hai ye-za, which implies an earlier gi-za. Of course, we should expect to find, as in other instances, that the Hebrews had given the name a shape more accordant with the analysis of their own language than that in which they originally received it.

The assimilation of the mysterious Azazel of Leviticus to the desert-fiend of primeval Babylon and the "spirit-goat" of the half-forgotten traditions of China, suggest many things in regard to the annual rites of the Great Day of Atonement. How far it bears on the great question of the antiquity of the narrative in Leviticus, and of the ceremonies there prescribed, I must leave to others to determine. Some points, at all events, are clear. (1) The idea of Azazel is even older than the time of Moses by thousands of years, how many no man can say. (2) Azazel is not, as has been suggested, "the crumbling conception of some Semitic or Egyptian idol, shrunk to the dimensions of a desert-fiend."† (3) The conception of Satan, the arch-enemy of God and man, has left more traces in the O. T. than is sometimes assumed, and was probably far older in Israel than the time of their supposed contact with Persian ideas. (4) The sending of the live goat into the wilderness "for Azazel" was a highly suggestive recognition of the religious doctrine that, in consequence of sin, the lives of the congregation were forfeited to the Avenging Spirit, who carried out the sentence of Yahweh's righteous wrath. (5) The fact that the goat was not slain but set free in the wilderness, symbolized the truth that Israel was saved, by penitential sacrifices to Yahweh the Saviour, from the power of the Destroyer; and (6) embodied in the plainest

* The Chinese signs are k'üen, kioh, tao, and niu, of which the ancient pronunciation was kin, kak, tar, ngu, respectively. The Accadian sign read gidim is a contracted compound of the (Accadian) signs for KIN, KAK, TAR, NGU.

† Die zu einem Wüsten-dämon zusammengeshrumpfte ruinenhafte Vorstellung irgend eines semitischen oder ägyptischen Abgottes. Reihm: *Hwb. Bibl. Alt. s. v. Azazel.*

manner a prohibition of devil-worship (cf. Lev. xvii. 7). It would seem that in this, as in so many other instances, Mosaism has purified and adopted the conceptions and practices of immemorial religion.

C. J. BALL.

Three Contract Tablets of Ashuritililani.—Among many other important tablets which were excavated during the stay of the *Expedition of the Babylonian Exploration Fund* at Niffer, in 1889, were three contract tablets belonging to the reign of Ašûritililâni. For the sake of convenience, I will call these tablets 1, 2 and 3. No. 1 was found on the 14th of February, and it was on the 28th of the same month that Prof. Hilprecht read the date as Nippûru arĥu Šabâtu ûmu 20. m. ilu Ašûr-êtil-ilu (*sic*) šar mâtu Aš-[šur-Ki]. It is, perhaps, the half of a large reddish-gray tablet, the obverse side being badly mutilated, the reverse, on the other hand, being very well preserved. The name of the king is not so clear, as one would judge from Prof. Hilprecht's remarks in *ZA.*, IV., 2. He himself queries his own reading. If the name is to be read Ašûritilili, this brings nothing new, since it is so written on his brick published in *I R.*, p. 8. This tablet has passed into the hands of the Turkish government and hence we may never expect to see it again.

Of much greater importance are Nos. 2 and 3, both of which were excavated on March 4th, and were identified by me on the following day, after they had been cleaned, as belonging to Ašûritililâni, cf. the *Academy*, April 30, 1889, and *ZA.*, IV., 2. Both of these tablets were handed over to the government, but were later on presented to me by my friend Bedri-Bey, the Turkish Commissioner to the Expedition. They are now in my possession. After publishing them, it is my purpose to present them to the University of Pennsylvania.

No. 2 is a small blackish-grey contract, or rather loan tablet, 4.3×3.1×1.2 cms. in size. It is almost perfectly preserved. A small piece was broken off, however, while it was being handled by the officers in the custom house at Iskanderûn. The following is a brief summary of the contents of this tablet, viz.: Adar-aĥê-erêb has loaned eight shekels of silver to a man—about whose name there is some doubt. From the first day of Araĥšamna it is to bear interest at the rate of one-half shekel. A list of four witnesses follows, and then, what is of most importance to us, the date, viz.: Nippûru araĥ Araĥšamna umû 1 šattu 4 Ašûritililâni šar mâtu A-šûr-Ki. In my note to the *Academy*, I read the date of the year as 6. I was, perhaps, a little too enthusiastic at the time about my find and hence was inclined to make the date as large as possible. It can be read 6, but it is better to regard the two lower wedges as prolongations of upper wedges and to make the number 4.

No. 3 is a greyish-brown loan tablet, 5.1×3.8×1.2 cms. in size. It is badly broken and the names of the parties concerned in the contract are not legible. The date reads: Nippûru araĥ Addaru—day lost—šattu 2 Ašûritililâni šar mâtu Aššûr. This tablet also was somewhat damaged by the rough handling of the Turkish custom officers.

The value of these tablets is from a chronological and historical stand-point. They make it necessary for Assyriologists to change their views in regard to the date of the separation of the Babylonian from the Assyrian empire, cf. *Academy* and *ZA.* as cited above. I hope to publish the text of Nos. 2 and 3 in the next number of *HEBRAICA*.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, *Yale University*.

◀SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.▶

- ABEL, H. u. WINCKLER, H. Keilinschrifttexte zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen. Berlin: W. Spemann. 1890.....M.15.
- AMIAUD, A., et SCHEIL, V. Les Inscriptions de Salmanassar II. roi d'Assyrie (860-824). Transcrites, coordonnées, traduites et commentées. Paris: H. Welter. 1890...Fr.2.50.
- BACHER, W. Critique of Strack's Schabbâth. ZDMG. Band 44. Heft 2.
- Salomon Ibn Parchon's hebräisches Wörterbuch, I. Ztsch. f. d. alttest. Wissenschaft. Band 10. Heft 1.
- BARTH, J. Critique of Stein's Das Verbum der Mischnasprache, of Rosenberg's Das aramäische Verbum im babylonischen Talmud, and of Schlesinger's Das aramäische Verbum im jerusalemischen Talmud. Deut. Ltzng., No. 26, 1890.
- BLOCH, ARMAND. "Phöniciſches." Mittheilungen d. Akad.-Orientalistischen Vereins zu Berlin. No. 3.
- BLUMENTHAL, L. Kritische Emendationen zu Gustav Bickell's Kalilag und Damnag. ZDMG. Band 44. Heft 2.
- BONAVIA, E. Bananas and Melons as Dessert Fruits of Assyrian Monarchs and Courtiers. BOR., IV., 8.
- BRUSTON, C. Trois lettres des Juifs de Palestine (Makkab. I.-II., 18). Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissenschaft. Band 10. Heft 1.
- CORNILL, C. H. Noch einmal Sauls Königswahl und Verwerfung. Ibid.
- Critique of Driver's Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. Athenæum, No. 3272, 1890.
- Critique of Arbuthnot's Arabic Authors. Ibid., No. 3272, 1890.
- DERENBOURG, J. Version d'Isaïe de R. Saadia. Ibid.
- ERMAN, ADOLF. מִצְרַיִם. Ibid.
- GOTTHEIL, RICHARD. Contributions to the History of Geography. 1) Adscensus Mentis of Gregorius Bar 'Ebhryā. Mittheilungen d. Akad.-Orientalistischen Vereins zu Berlin. No. 3.
- Honein bar Ishak. ZDMG. Band 44. Heft 2.
- GREEN, W. HENRY. The Titles of the Psalms. Meth. Review, July-Aug., 1890.
- KAY, H. C. Critique of Salmone's Arabic-English Lexicon. Academy, No. 951, 1890.
- LACOUPERIE, T. DE. On Eastern Names of the Banana. BOR., IV., 8.
- An Unknown King of Lagash, from a Lost Inscription of 6000 years ago. Ibid.
- MARSHALL, J. T. Did St. Paul use a Semitic Gospel? Expositor, July, 1890.
- MERRILL, SELAH. Jewish Laws of Inheritance. S. S. Times, August 2, 1890.
- MURCH, CHAUNCEY. The Beni-Hassan Cartouches. Academy, No. 955, 1890.
- NÖLDEKE, TH. Nachtrag zu der Anzeige von Kessler's Mani. ZDMG. Band 44. Heft 2.
- PEISER, F. E. Jurisprudentiae Babylonicæ quæ supersunt. Commentatio Assyriologica de nonnullis quæ in Museis et Britannico et Berolinensi extant tabulis. [Breslau Inaugural-dissertation.]
- POUCHER, JOHN. Is the Book of Daniel a Prophecy? Meth. Review, Sept.-Oct., 1890.
- SALMONÉ, H. Critique of Arbuthnot's Arabic Authors. Academy, No. 958, 1890.
- SAYCE, A. H. The Recovery of Lachish. Independent, August 28, 1890.
- Sculptured Slabs of Mesopotamia found in Egypt. Academy, No. 951, 1890.
- Hebrew Inscriptions of the Pre-Exilic Epoch. Ibid., No. 952, 1890.
- The Sculptured Slabs supposed to have been brought from Mesopotamia to Egypt. Ibid., No. 953, 1890.
- The Gods Zur and Ben-Hadad. Ib. No. 955, 1890.
- SCHRADER, E. Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten in Umschrift und Uebersetzung. Band III. 2 Hälfte. Berlin: H. Reuther.....M.6.
- TYLER, T. Critique of Driver's Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel. Academy, No. 951, 1890.
- The Goddess Kadesh and the Semitism of the Hittites. Ibid., No. 957, 1890.
- Rodwell on the Levitical Sacrifices. Ibid., No. 959, 1890.
- VAMBERY, H. Die Sarten und ihre Sprache. ZDMG. Band 44. Heft 2.
- VOLLERS, KARL. Aus der viceköniglichen Bibliothek in Kairo. II. Die medicinische Abtheilung. Ibid.
- Ša'rāw und Ša'rāni. Ibid.
- WELLHAUSEN, J. Critique of Brockelmann's Das Verhältniss von Ibn el Athîr's Kāmil fit-ta'rîḥ zu Tabarî's Aḥbār errusul wal-mulūk. ZDMG. Band 44. Heft 2.
- WIEGAND, A. Der Gottesname יוָה und seine Bedeutung in dem Sinne Bildner oder Schöpfer in der alten jüdischen Litteratur. Ztschr. f. d. alttest. Wissenschaft. Band 10. Heft 1.
- WRIGHT, W. Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. New York: MacMillan & Co.